1. Introduction

It is common knowledge that in many cases overt mention of subjects is unnecessary in Japanese. This is the reason there is often no need for an overt term referring, for example, to the first or second person in discourse. The referent is usually left out in what is referred to as unmarked situations, i.e., cases where it can be identified through a grammatical construction or inferred from honorific mode or deictic expressions (e.g., verbs of giving and receiving), or it represents the (paragraph) topic or can be understood through contextual cues. Studies of ellipsis in Japanese abound, but the natural extension of such inquiries, namely, those aimed at answering the question “What functions do terms of reference generally have when they are present?” are fewer in number.

This paper is intended to fill in some of the gaps left by earlier studies dealing with (so-called) Japanese personal pronouns. Earlier studies have focused on the multitude of possible different pronominal and other forms and the factors determining their choice in a number of imaginary situations, but my purpose is to look at first and second person pronouns occurring in Japanese conversation from an interactional perspective: What do personal pronouns do in conversation, what are their communicative functions? Although I have adopted the standard term “personal pronoun” in the present study, I intend to demonstrate that, in many cases, linguistic entities covered by this term in Japanese do not correspond to personal pronouns in languages such as English or Finnish, for example. Rather, Japanese pronouns could be considered to represent a point on a (non-language-specific) continuum extending from nouns to morphologically distinct pronominal forms. I carry out my examination by analyzing first and second person pronoun use in conversational interaction depicted in five Japanese films and discuss the following points: (1) various pronominal forms and restrictions related to their use in conversation, (2) structural environments requiring the use of pronominal forms or other overt terms of reference, (3) 2nd person pronouns as vocative terms, (4) 2nd person pronouns as affect keys or
interactional adjustors, and (5) personal pronouns in linguistic strategies. The approach I apply is interactional in its orientation and focuses on the function of given linguistic items analyzed in specific contexts.

2. Japanese “personal pronouns”

2.1. Different pronominal forms

Terms that are used to refer to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person in Japanese comprise not only (so-called) personal pronouns, but also various other categories, such as (professional) titles, kinship terms, proper names, status terms, and so forth. The question of whether Japanese has an independent morphological or syntactic category of personal pronouns has been a controversial topic in Japanese linguistics, and researchers appear to be divided on the issue. Some make no distinction between nouns and so-called personal pronouns (and other pronouns) (e.g., Garnier, 1994; Kiyose, 1995; Suzuki, 1973; Teramura, 1982), while others prefer to employ nonstandard terms, such as “person terms” (Bachnik, 1982) (or “ninshoo meishi” ‘personal nouns’) (Takubo, 1997), instead of “personal pronouns” or talk about a noun-pronoun continuum (Sugamoto, 1989), and still others simply speak of a class of Japanese personal pronouns with no reference to any possible unsettled questions concerning this topic. The latter generally consider Japanese to have an extremely high number of personal pronouns, from which a speaker of the language must select the most appropriate one, taking into consideration the relations existing between the speaker and addressee and other persons present, the formality of the situation, sex and age of the interactants, etc.

Figure (1) is displays the most common pronominal forms in the first person.¹

¹ According to Onishi (1994: 362), in the case of male speakers the term atashi should be treated as a “variant of a social dialect”. He includes also the term atakushi for female speakers in the same category. Ide (1982: 358) includes the female atakushi in her list of “representative forms of person referents” and marks it as a variant of relatively high degree of honorification. Shibatani (1990: 371) does not mention the term.
Figure 1. Gender distinction in Japanese first person pronominal forms (adapted from Ide 1982: 358-359, Shibatani 1990: 371, and Onishi 1994: 362)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>ore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>atashi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Watashi is extremely formal for men, but slightly less so for female speakers. Although prescriptively the standard form, watashi often sounds relatively formal in men’s speech. It could, however, be described as the average pronominal form for women. The female pronoun atakushi, on the other hand, is sometimes referred to as “snobbish” (Harada 1976: 511) and is used more infrequently than the other forms. Boku is the term generally employed by men, although, from a prescriptive point of view, the term is not recommended when addressing a social superior. The usual colloquial forms, used for example with close friends and family members, are atashi for women and ore for men.

Figure (2) displays the most common pronominal forms used in the second person.\(^2\)

Figure 2. Gender distinction in Japanese second person pronominal forms (adapted from Ide 1982: 358-359, Shibatani 1990: 371, and Onishi 1994: 362)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>omae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Formal</th>
<th>Informal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>anta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Anata is considered to be standard and polite and is usually the first second person pronoun taught to non-native language learners. It cannot, however, be used when addressing a social superior. In addition to anata, male speakers can have recourse to various other second person forms: kimi and anta are generally used to refer to addressees of lower (or sometimes equal) social status and omae

\(^2\) Onishi (1994: 362) treats the term anta as a “variant of a social dialect” in both men’s speech and women’s speech. Ide (1982: 359) lists the same term solely for female speakers.
is informal and colloquial, sometimes even pejorative. By contrast, female
speakers generally have only one informal and colloquial form in their repertoire:
anta.

The terms listed in figures (1) and (2) are all singular forms, and plural
forms can be obtained by adding one of the following suffixes: -tachi, -gata, -ra,
-domo. In reality, the total number of forms which are generally considered to
be first or second person pronouns is much larger. Lists compiled by other
researchers may therefore differ from those presented here and non-standard
variants of Japanese may display other terms or different uses of the
aforementioned terms.4

It is important to note that the terms displayed in these figures are not free
variants. As a rule, second person pronouns cannot be used to address a person
of higher status, and proper nouns, kinship terms or titles must be substituted
instead. The use of pronominal forms in Japanese is actually relatively limited —
in that they constitute a part of the honorific system — and thus depends on the
level of speech. Selection of a specific overt first or second person pronoun bears
a direct link to what kind of verb forms are appropriate in the same context. Thus,
for example the casual first person male pronoun ore cannot be employed with
humble or polite verb forms as in Ore wa Kyooto kata mairimashita ‘I came
(humble and polite) from Kyoto’. Linguistic politeness in Japanese is generally
described in terms of two dimensions: casual — polite and humble — honorific.
The casual — polite axis sets the so-called psychological distance between speech
participants in any particular face-to-face interaction and determines the choice
of verb forms: short -da/ru (copula/verb ending) forms indicate a casual
interpersonal relationship and an informal situation, while so-called neutral polite
-desu/masu (copula/verb ending) forms are used to show politeness in more
formal relationships and also between close friends in formal situations. So-called
humble forms are employed to “lower” oneself or persons related to oneself in
front of a higher status addressee and respectful forms are used to show deference
to the addressee (or a third person). Possible combinations for the verb ‘to go’
include for example iku (casual and informal, 1st, 2nd or 3rd pers.), ikimasu (neutral
polite, 1st, 2nd or 3rd pers), irassharu (casual and respectful, 2nd or 3rd pers.),
irasshaimasu (polite and respectful, 2nd or 3rd pers.) and mairimasu (polite and
humble, 1st (or 3rd) pers.). If the agent cannot be inferred from the context, an

---

3 See example (4) and Harada (1976: 511), Hinds (1978: 140, 179) and Takubo (1997: 18) for
a detailed discussion.
4 See section 2.3. for more examples.
overt term of reference must be added.

2.2. Etymology of pronominal forms

Some of the researchers who do not separate the aforementioned terms from nouns approach the issue of categorization from a diachronic perspective. If one examines such personal pronouns as the English you or the Finnish sinä and te, one finds that they usually cannot be traced back to words with more lexical meanings by the average speaker. Their most prominent feature is their deictic component (Braun, 1988:257). Given the fact that, etymologically, the majority of so-called Japanese personal pronouns are derived from regular nouns, that is, they once had—and some of them still have—specific meanings such as ‘servant’ (boku), ‘emperor, ruler’ (kimi), and so on, it can be said that Japanese has no genuine personal pronouns and, therefore, no grammatical category of person in the same sense as English does, for example. The indexical use of terms such as kimi ‘you’ (originally ‘emperor, ruler’) was originally motivated by the terms’ symbolic value and they are, as Quinn (1994:45, 70) puts it, “symbols-turned-indexes”. Other terms include extensions from spatial deictics, such as anata ‘you’ (‘direction away from speaker’) or omae ‘you’ (‘honored-in-front’).

2.3. Pronominal forms in dictionaries

The primary function of nouns as a lexical category is to name an entity, while that of pronouns is to refer to an entity. It is characteristic of nouns as a category to be high in degrees of semantic specificity, whereas lexical and semantic contents of a class of pronouns are typically limited to broad features such as animacy and gender (Sugamoto, 1989:270-271).

Lyons (1977: 638, 640) states that what is central to the grammatical category of person in any particular language is the notion of participant-roles together with the grammaticalization of these roles and, more specifically, the grammaticalization of the speaker’s reference to himself or herself as the speaker. In many known languages these roles are grammaticalized as personal pronouns, but it is clear that pronouns are by no means indispensable. As can be exemplified by the Finnish expression Soita-t-ko viulu-a? ‘Do you play the violin?’, where reference to the second person is marked by -t in the predicate verb soittaa ‘to play’, the category of person can also be grammaticalized by inflecting the main verb.
In English, first and second person pronouns *I* and *you* can be characterized as being purely deictic: “They refer to the locutionary agent and the addressee without conveying any additional information about them” (Lyons 1981: 232). In Japanese, on the other hand, the situation is somewhat different. The first person pronoun *boku* ‘I’, for example, usually indicates that the speaker is a (young) male and/or not talking to a social superior. In the second person, Japanese personal pronouns act in a different way from English pronouns in the sense that, under normal circumstances (i.e., when the speaker is not for example trying to insult the addressee) they cannot be used in addressing social superiors at all. Accordingly, a token of *omae* ‘you’, for example, generally always indicates that the person so addressed is either a social inferior or an equal.

When viewed from a strictly synchronic perspective, it is clear that the symbolic meanings of *boku*, *kimi*, and so forth, have, in most cases, given way to indexicality. Dictionaries, however, still include the original nominal meanings of these terms. In modern Japanese (as represented in the *Kenkyusha’s New Japanese-English Dictionary*, 1974), out of the most common first person pronouns, some are (still) listed both as pronouns and as regular nouns, while others are defined solely as pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>watakushi</em></td>
<td>1) pron. I; myself; self; 2) n. privateness; privacy; partiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>watashi</em></td>
<td>pron. [= <em>watakushi</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ware</em></td>
<td>pron. (literary) I; you (cf. <em>ware</em>: n. oneself; self; ego)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>washī</em></td>
<td>pron. (slang) I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>boku</em></td>
<td>1) = <em>shimobe</em>: n. a (man) servant; 2) pron. I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ore</em></td>
<td>pron. (slang) I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ora</em></td>
<td>pron. (dialect) I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kochira</em></td>
<td>pron. 1) this place; here; this side; this way; 2) this (one); we; I; your house; you</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same is true for a number of second person pronouns as well:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>anata</em></td>
<td>pron. you; (hail) I say; say; (to husband from wife) (my) dear; (my) darling; (my) honey (cf. <em>anata</em>: n. [elegant] [= <em>achira</em>: 1) that; the other; 2) there; yonder]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>anta</em></td>
<td>pron. (slang) you [= <em>anata</em>]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kimi</em></td>
<td>1) n. a ruler; a sovereign; a monarch; an emperor; 2) pron. you; (hail) old boy; old chap; old man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>omae</em></td>
<td>pron. (slang) 1) you; old man [fellow]; (between husband and wife) (my) dear; darling; honey; (to a child) my child [boy, son, daughter]; 2) (to an inferior) Hey, you!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As these listings attempt to show, the multiple forms of first and second person pronouns have relatively versatile uses in spoken discourse. According to the dictionary, terms such as *omae*, for example, can be employed with such positive connotations as ‘my dear’, ‘old chap’ or ‘my child’ as well as in relatively rude utterances of the type *hey, you*.\(^5\)

### 2.4. Morphological and syntactic properties

Cross-linguistically the class of nouns is a nonfinite category of words, while the class of pronouns is usually understood to be a paradigmatic set of a limited number of terms. In Japanese, personal pronouns form an open class and could perhaps best be characterized as points on a (non-language-specific) continuum extending from nouns to morphologically distinct pronominal forms. If necessary, for example such loan terms as *yuu* and *mii* (from the English *you* and *me*) can be employed in the same function as *anata* and *watashi*, and the like (Takubo 1997: 14).

Another factor speaking in favour of a combined category of nouns and pronouns in Japanese is their similar morphology. Nouns and pronouns do not differ in their morphological behaviour and so-called pronouns do not have a characteristic declension for cases (Sugamoto, 1989: 269):

---

\(^5\) Russell (1981: 126-127) documents that, when asked whether they feel a ‘vertical relationship’ (*joogekankei*) when pronouns *anata*, *anta*, *kimi* and *omae* are being used, her informants (seventy university students) reported the following: A vertical relationship was felt with the use of *omae* by 100\% of female (f) informants and by 75,9\% of males (m). The percentages for *kimi*, *anta* and *anata* were lower: *kimi*: 89,7 (f) and 75,9\% (m); *anta*: 66,7\% (f) and 69\% (m); *anata*: 46,2\% (f) and 48,3\% (m).
Likewise, nouns and pronouns can take the same suffixes for plural forms:

(4) *gakusei-tachi/watashi-tachi* ‘student-pl’/‘I-pl’

Gakuseitachi/watashitachi wa hon o yondeimasu.

‘The students/we are reading a book.’

There is, nevertheless, a difference between nouns and pronouns with regard to the use of plural suffixes: pronouns such as *watashi* ‘I’ are obligatorily marked for number (or grouping), but in the case of nouns the use of plural (or grouping) suffixes such as *-tachi* in (4) is optional (Hinds, 1986: 250.).

If morphological constancy and the capacity to take morphological extensions are taken to be characteristics of nouns as a distinct category, we may
say that Japanese pronouns, which share the same morphological capacity as nouns, are more nominal than for example their English counterparts, which have a markedly different morphological behaviour from nouns (Sugamoto, 1989: 269).

Furthermore, adjectives and demonstratives can modify pronouns as they modify nouns:

(5) *kono kare, lit. ‘this he’
Kono gakusei/watashi ni dekiru no kashira.
this student/I can do IP IP
‘I wonder if this student/I can do it.’

The demonstrative kono ‘this’ could be interpreted to stand for something like konna/kono yoona tsumaranai watashi ‘a worthless I like this’.

(6) ookii gakusei/ookii warashi ‘big student’/lit. ‘big I’ (ookii kare, lit. ‘big he’)
Kono ookii gakusei/watashi ni wa muri desu.
this big student/I TOP impossible COP
‘It won’t work with this big student/me’, e.g. the student is/I am too big for something.

In this context it is important to note that overt reference to the first and second person occurs much less frequently in Japanese than in European languages. It has been suggested that the frequency of ellipted subjects in Japanese ranges from 37% to 75% (Danwago no Jittai, 1955). Clancy (1980: 133), comparing Japanese and English, reports that in narrative discourse English speakers use ellipsis in roughly 21% of the places where a nominal argument is possible, while speakers of Japanese ellipt nominal arguments approximately 73% of the time. Furthermore, Garnier (1993: 73) provides an example of a film dialogue in which only 9% of the original Japanese utterances which required a first person pronoun in the French translation actually had an overt first person term.

The frequency of ellipsis in Japanese can be better understood if we consider the following observations. First, Japanese speech participants rely heavily on context. Also various characteristics of Japanese help the addressee indentify the actual referents of zero forms. Okazaki (1994: 110-111) refers to “unmarked ellipses”, which she defines as instances of ellipsis meeting one or both of the following conditions: (1) “missing elements are uniquely recoverable by structural clues (such as the subject of the imperatives)” or (2) “elided elements
are within the speaker’s consciousness in terms of preceding contexts (such as topics of conversations, answers to questions) or in terms of immediate physical contexts (such as the ‘you’ and the ‘I’ in face-to-face communication)” (emphasis mine). According to Okazaki (ibid. 114), the most common type of ellipsis is deletion of noun phrases. Observe the following:

(7) speakers: Shinkichi (S) and Kikue (K), elderly married couple

1  K: [Anta (wa)] Doo shita no? Doko ga warui n ka ne. [you (TOP)] how did Q where S bad NOM Q IP
   ‘What did you do?/What’s the matter? Where is it that it’s hurting?’

2  S: Nanka mune ga kurushii wa. some chest S painful IP
   ‘It’s like my chest is aching.’

3  K: Oisha ikoo ka. doctor go-VOL Q
   ‘Shall we go and see a doctor?’

4  S: Iya, ee wa. [Ore (wa)] Chotto yoko ni nattara naoru no ok IP [I (TOP)] a little horizontal IO if become get well kamoshiren de. perhaps IP
   ‘No, it’s ok. If I just lie down a little, it might get better.’ (O: 13)⁹

As can be seen, English translation of this excerpt requires addition of personal referents (you, we, I), although no overt terms can be found in the Japanese original. The glossing of verb forms such as shita as ‘did’ and nattara as ‘if become’ is intended to show that, contrary to what one might expect, Japanese verbs are not inflected in person. The volitional verb form ikoo generally refers to the first person plural (‘let’s go’), but can be used also in the first person singular.¹⁰ In example (7) it automatically refers to the first person plural. Adding second and first person referents anta ‘you’ and ore ‘I’ (with or without the topic marker wa) to the original Japanese version would not make the utterances ungrammatical. In the described context it would, however, bring on a slight nuance of contrast or emphasis. On the other hand, anta without a topic marker in line 1 could function as a vocative.¹¹ Even though ellipsis in Japanese is

⁹ "(O: 13)" refers to the scenario of Osooshiki, page 13. See data references for other abbreviations.
¹⁰ The volitional form can sometimes be heard even in the second person.
¹¹ See section 3.2. for more details.
generally regarded as "the non-presence of entities in surface forms of utterances which the speaker assumes that the hearer can fill in from linguistic and/or extra-linguistic contexts" (Okazaki 1994: 7), closer examination of discourse contexts demonstrates that, in many cases, addition of the so-called ellipted elements would actually change the connotation/interpretation of the utterance.

In addition to certain pragmatic conditions, there are a number of structural environments, which require the use of an overt term of reference in Japanese. In his discussion on pronominalization, Hinds (1978: 143) mentions possessive constructions as one of the contexts where—when pragmatically permitted—pronominalization is likely to occur. Examples (1) and (2) offer additional contexts.\(^\text{12}\)

3. Personal pronouns in conversation

3.1. You and I in film dialogues

In the following I will examine the occurrence of overt first and second person referents in Japanese film dialogues. It is, of course, evident that conversational interaction as depicted in films differs largely from naturally occurring conversation. Film dialogues are created by scriptwriters, linguistically gifted persons aiming at producing artistic effects. Such dialogues are therefore considerably tidied-up and edited versions of conversation, in which permanent features of natural talk such as mistakes, hesitation, overlapping and so forth rarely occur. Compared to "idle chat", they usually have add to the advancement of the plot. Despite these obvious disadvantages, there are, nevertheless, reasons which support the choice of film dialogs as research material. As they represent

\(^{12}\) Even in these cases the *pronoun* is however not "obligatory" in that a *noun*, such as a name, kinship term or title, could be used instead (Hinds, 1986: 241). The question whether pronominal forms are compulsory in some constructions becomes more complicated if one considers the discourse context. Hinds (1986: 241) states that "[w]ithin a specific discourse, many of the pronouns which may be left out in a decontextualized utterance are more or less required because they mark such matters as thematic progression, or they delineate episode boundaries". In another study, Hinds (1983: 84) further suggests that, in Japanese, pronouns have a specific role in topic continuity: they form an intermediate category between full noun phrases and ellipsis, a fact which, according to Hinds, "demonstrates that they do in fact constitute a unique grammatical category". See Hinds (1983, 1986) for more details. While Hinds is more concerned about overt reference in narrative texts, example (18) below illustrates that nouns and pronouns also show some distributional differences in conversational contexts.
the spoken style, they offer a useful source of data for investigations dealing with some aspects of conversational interaction. Furthermore, in contrast to literary and auditory material, visual material naturally has the advantage of allowing the observation of nonverbal communication.

Dialogues depicted in the examined films represent a fairly wide variety of situations and characters of different ages, backgrounds and relationships and thus display various types of reference term use. Situations depicted in the films range from extremely formal and ritualistic talk, for example at wedding receptions and funerals, to conversations between family members and close friends. For the most part, the language employed in the films is considered to represent the standard variant, and there is a progression in time from the 1950’s to the mid-1980’s. More recent films are not included, but since the focus of my interest is the occurrence of person terms in utterances and not their quality, nature or anything of that kind, it seems safe to maintain that the suggested film material provides a reasonably reliable source for examples. Any speaker or observer of colloquial spoken Japanese today can notice without fail that identical uses of person terms are manifested frequently in natural talk, a fact acknowledged also in previous works examining natural data.

The closest one can get to the English pronouns I and you in Japanese conversational interaction could perhaps be illustrated by the following example. The excerpt features three men, Horie (Ho), Hirayama (Hi) and Kawai (Ka), all aged 57, who used to be high school classmates and are now good friends. First person pronouns (ore) are underlined and second person pronouns (omae) appear boldfaced. (LN Horie used in second person-designation appears in italics.)

8 speakers: Horie (Ho) (57), Hirayama (Hi) (57), Kawai (Ka) (57), ex-classmates

1 Ho: (to Hirayama) Kondo wa omae no ban da na. next time TOP you GEN turn COP IP

   ‘It’s your turn now.’

2 Hi: Nani ga? what S

   ‘To do what?’

3 Ho: Wakai no. Doo dai, wakai no. young NOM how Q young NOM

   ‘To get a young one. How about it, a young one?’

4 Ka: (to Horie) Okusuri nonde ka. medicine taking Q

   ‘Are you taking your pills?’
5 Ho: Aa, moratchae, moratchae.
receive receive
‘Yes, go on, get yourself a young one.’
6 Hi: (to Horie) Ore wa ne Horie, kono goro omae ga doomo fuketsu ni
I TOP IP LN this time you S very dirty look
mierun da ga ne.
like NOM COP but IP
‘You know, Horie, you’re starting to look somehow dirty to me.’
7 Ho: Fuketsu? Dooshite?
dirty why
‘Dirty? How come?’
8 Hi: Nantonaku na.
somehow IP
‘Well, just somehow.’
9 Ho: Iyaa, ore a kirei-zuki da yo.
no I TOP clean-lover COP IP
‘Oh no, I’m clean, I tell you, that’s what I like.’
10 Ka: Kirei-zuki you r wa sukoburu-ni kitana-zuki ka.
 liking clean night TOP extremely dirty-lover Q
‘Oh yeah, you like being clean... and at night you like being very dirty. right?’
11 Ho: A, soo ka. Aha... (everybody starts laughing) (S: 366)
like that Q
‘Oh, well if that’s what you mean...’

In this excerpt, Horie is teasing Hirayama who is just back from his daughter’s wedding. Horie, who has recently married a young woman himself, is suggesting to Hirayama that now it is Hirayama who should remarry and get a young wife. Previously, he has been boasting about the pleasures of being married to a young woman. He has also been taking some kind of medicine or vitamins, bought for him by his young wife, and the other men, Hirayama and Kawai, often joke about this. As can be seen, Hirayama does not appreciate Horie’s comments and reproaches him.

What is noteworthy in this example is that the first person term (ore) and the second person term (omae) are used reciprocally between the interactants. Hirayama employs ore when speaking to Horie (line 6) and Horie utilizes the same term reciprocally (line 9). Similarly, Horie uses omae when addressing Hirayama (line 1) and Hirayama employs the same term in response (line 6). Thus, the actual referents of the terms ore and omae keep alternating all through the conversation in a way similar to the English I and you (line 6: ore = Hirayama; line 9: ore = Horie; line 1: omae = Hirayama; line 6: omae = Horie). The situation depicted in example (8) can be illustrated as:
Figure 3. First and second person pronominal forms between social equals (men)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hirayama</th>
<th>&lt; ore ‘I’</th>
<th>&lt;&gt;</th>
<th>ore ‘I’</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>Horie</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt; omae ‘you’</td>
<td></td>
<td>omae ‘you’</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note, however, that overt reference to the first and second person occurs much less frequently in Japanese than in the English translation. As example (8) demonstrates, in Japanese effective use of verb forms, context and nonverbal communication often render overt personal reference unnecessary. Someone familiar with European languages might therefore expect that Japanese verbs must be inflected in person. As we have seen, this, however, is not the case. The reciprocal use of first and second person pronouns illustrated in example (8) is, in fact, not a common feature in Japanese communication. In our example, we are dealing with close friends and social equals, members of the same in-group (note also the use of the verb morau ‘receive’ in line 5), which makes possible the reciprocation of colloquial terms such as ore and omae. In many other contexts—and possibly also in a more formal context with the same interactants—this is not the case. A brief look at example (9) might help to illustrate this point.

In this example we are dealing with a conversation between a 57-year old father and his 24-year old daughter. First person terms are underlined and second person terms appear boldfaced.

(9) speakers: Hirayama (57) (H) and Michiko (24) (M), Hirayama’s daughter

1 H: Nee, oi.
   IP  hey
   ‘Hey, Michiko.’

2 M: Naani?
    what
    ‘What?’

3 H: Omae, oyome ni ikanai ka.
    you  bride to go-NEG Q
    ‘You don’t want to get married?’

4 M: E?
    what
    ‘What?’
H: Oyome da yo, ikanai ka.

'Yes, get married, you don’t want to do it?'

M: (with a laugh) Nani itten no!

'What on earth are you saying?'


'No, I’m serious, really seriously.'

M: Otoosan yotten no ne, mata.

'You're drunk again, aren’t you?'

H: Aa, sukoshi nonderu kedo ne. honki na n da yo.

'Well, I’ve had a few drinks, but I’m really serious about this.'

M: Sukoshi ja nai wa yo. Dooshite sonna koto kangaetsuita no?

'It's not a just few drinks. What gave you an idea like that?'

H: Dooshite tte... Iroiro ne. Ma, kotchi oide.

'How... Well, because of all kinds of things. Come here now.'

M: Chotto matte. Moo sugu dakara...

'Wait a minute. I'm almost finished.'

H: Otoosan, iroiro kangaeta n dakedo ne...

'You know, I've been thinking about all kinds of things... Well. come and sit down with me now.' (Michiko switches off her iron and sits down with her father)

M: Demo, atashi ga ittara komarya shinai?

'But if I get married, won’t you be in trouble-TOP do-NEG'

H: Komattemo ne, moo sorosoro ikanai to...

'Even if be in trouble IP already soon go-NEG if'

Omae mo nijuushi dakara ne.

'Even if I'll be in trouble, if you don't get married soon... You're also already twenty-four,'

M: Soo yo. Dakara mada ii wa yo.

'That's right. And that's why it's still alright.'
17 H: Shikashi ne, mada ii, mada ii tte itteru uchi-ni, but IP still ok QT saying while itsu no manika toshi o before realizing year DO toru n da. take NOM COP 
18 Otoosan, tsui omae o benri-ni tsukatte, father unintentionally you DO usefully use 
suman to omotteru n da yo. NOM COP IP 
'But while you're saying it's still alright, it's still alright, you get older before you know it. I've been taking advantage of your situation and I feel sorry for it.' 
19 M: Dakara, doo shiro tte iu no yo. Atashi ne otoosan, that is why how do-VOL QT say IP IP I IP father 
mada mada oyome ni nanka yet yet bride to some 
20 ikanai tsumori de iru no yo. go-NEG intention be IP IP 
Ikeya shinai to omotteru no yo. otoosan datte soo cannot go QT thinking IP IP father even like that 
21 omotteta n ja nai. was thinking NOM COP-NEG 
'That's why I'm saying, what to do. You know, Dad, I've got no intention to get married yet. I don't think it's possible. Wasn't that the way you felt too?'
22 H: Nani? what 'What way?' (...) 
23 M: Kangeta n nara, moo sonna katten koto iwanaide yo. thought NOM if' anymore like that selfish thing do not say IP 
'If you've been thinking about it, don't say such selfish things. 
24 H: Katte ja nai yo. selfish COP-NEG IP 
'It's not selfish. 
25 M: Katte yo. selfish IP 
'It's selfish alright.' (gets up and starts collecting the laundry) 
26 H: Oi!... Oi! Michiko! hey hey 'Hey!... Hey, Michiko! (S: 353-354)

The father, as a social superior, may use a second person pronoun such as
omae to his own daughter, both in referential and vocative function. The first name Michiko, however, is reserved solely for vocative function. As a first person referent he is not using a personal pronoun but the kinship term otoosan ‘father’. The same otoosan is employed by his daughter when addressing him, both in referential and vocative function. In normal circumstances, a second person pronoun is not an option available for her. Furthermore, although her father, as a social superior, has the option to employ a kinship term when referring to himself (he could also use the first person pronoun ore), she cannot do the same. Instead she uses the first person pronoun atashi.

Lyons (1977: 639-644) points out that, despite the existence of first and second person pronouns in many known languages, it is possible to hypothesize a language which does not have such pronouns. To illustrate this, he constructs an imaginative version of English, a “Quasi-English”. “Quasi-English” is a fictional version of English with a set of definite expressions, servant and master, used instead of first and second person pronouns. With regard to the category of person, “Quasi-English”, which thus relies solely on ordinary nouns in referential and vocative functions and has no verb inflection, differs from standard English in that it has no grammatical category of person:

**Figure 4.** "Quasi-English" first and second person terms (adapted from Lyons 1977: 642).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>social superior</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>master</th>
<th>&lt; &gt;</th>
<th>servant</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
<th>social inferior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;</td>
<td>servant</td>
<td></td>
<td>master</td>
<td>&lt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our Japanese example of a father–daughter dyad partially overlaps with the social superior–social inferior case hypothesized by Lyons: just like the term master in “Quasi-English”, otoosan ‘father’ can be used in self-reference by the father, and the same term is employed to him in address by his daughter. In our example, however, there is no equivalent term which could be employed in the way of the “Quasi-English” servant.14 Instead, personal pronouns omae and

---

13 See section 3.2. for more examples of vocatives.
14 The masculine first person pronoun boku (originally ‘humble servant’), however, can be used in the manner of the “Quasi-English” servant in one particular case: a young boy can use it in self-reference (Ide, 1979/1991: 47) and the same term can be used by adults when addressing the boy. Fischer (1970: 111) explains that this is done for instructional purposes.
atashi are used. However, it must be pointed out that Japanese language also allows the use of a proper name in our example. Thus the father can address his daughter with her first name (Michiko), and the daughter, on the other hand, could use the same term in self-reference. This kind of usage of an inferior person’s first name would, then, be similar to the functioning of the term servant in Lyons’s paradigm, the difference, again, being that the name Michiko can naturally be used solely to Michiko and not to someone else.

3.2. Bound forms of address and free forms of address

Braun (1988: 11) demonstrates that in many languages it is possible to make a distinction between so-called “bound forms of address” and “free forms of address”: syntactically bound forms of address are considered to be integrated parts of sentences, whereas syntactically free forms generally occur “outside” the sentence construction (preceding/succeeding the sentence or inserted into the sentence) as vocatives. In languages like French, Dutch, English and Finnish, for example, bound forms tend to be pronouns of address, whereas nouns of address usually appear as free forms:

(10) Est-ce que tu [B] partiras avec Marie?
    ‘Will you leave with Marie?’ (French)

(11) Mijnheer Gaens [F], kan ik even met u spreken?
    ‘Mr. Gaens, may I talk to you for a moment?’ (Dutch)

However, the reverse is also possible:

(12) You [F]. where have you been all night? (English)

(13) Ja mitä rouvalle [B] saisi olla?
    ‘And what would madam (-lle: allative case) like to have?’ (Finnish)

In Japanese, however, there are less restrictions as to the nature of bound and free forms of address:

(14) Kimi to Wada kara shinda Wada o hikeba,
    you-B and LN from dead LN DO subtract-COND

(1 have also witnessed a case in which boku was used as an address term by a middle-aged female professor when addressing her student, a young man in his late twenties.)
kimi dake nokoru...(W: 27)
you-B only be left
[JWada and you were the only ones that know that set-up.] And since Wada is dead that leaves only you...’ (Ba: 152)

(15) Shikashi kimi... Are wa kondo no nyuusatsu ni yabureta gyoosha but you-F that TOP this time GEN bidding in lost business competitor
no iyagarase to shika omoen ga... (W: 27)
GEN prank QT only can think-NEG but
‘But listen... I can’t believe that was any more than a mean prank of a jealous business competitor who lost in the bidding...’ (Ba: 151)

(16) Doozo otoosan mo go-isshoni... (S: 357)
please father-B also HON-together
‘Please, have dinner with us...’

(17) Atashi ne otoosan, mada mada oyome ni nanka ikanai tsumori de iru no yo. (S: 354)
I IP father-F yet yet bride to some not go intention be IP IP
‘You know Dad, I’ve got no intention to get married yet.’

In example (14) the personal pronoun kimi ‘you (generally used by men to social equals or inferiors)’ occurs as a syntactically bound form, while in example (15) the same pronoun is used as a free form in vocative function. Similarly, in example (16) the noun otoosan ‘father’ occurs as a bound form, but the same noun can be used also in vocative function, as exemplified by (17). This distinction is reflected in the English translation: in example (14), the personal pronoun kimi is translated as you when occurring as a bound form of address, while the corresponding free form in example (15) has been rendered into English by the attention-getting marker listen. The English pronoun you can pick up rather unfavorable connotations when used as a free form, as exemplified in example (12), which is why, in most cases, Japanese personal pronouns occurring as free forms of address must be translated into English by personal names, titles, attention-getting devices or other vocative-like terms. Example (16), however, demonstrates that the reverse is often necessary in contexts where Japanese nouns such as otoosan ‘father’ occur as bound forms of address. They can generally be translated into English by the personal pronoun you.

Although both nouns and pronouns occur as bound and free forms of address in Japanese, there are some distributional differences: bound forms of address are selected from a more restricted array of person terms than free forms. The difference is due to the fact that a speaker who is in a position to use both
personal pronouns and nouns (usually a social superior or equal) often opts for the former in the case of bound forms and for the latter in the case of free forms:

(18) Wada-san, ittai anata wa kono hatsuka-kan dare
    LN-SUFF-F on earth you-B TOP this for twenty days who
    no tame-ni mokuhiken o tsukatteorareru n desu? (W: 14)
    GEN for right of silence DO using-HON NOM COP

    'Mr. Wada, just who is it that you are trying to protect by maintaining the right of silence for these twenty days? (Ba: 129)

In this example the LN + suffix expression Wada-san is used as a free form and the personal pronoun anata ‘you’ appears as a bound form (Länsisalmi, 1998, 1999).

3.3. Interactional adjustors

In this section, I further examine one specific aspect of overt personal pronouns, namely, pronouns occurring at the end of utterances. In conversational Japanese, highly discourse-predictable and seemingly redundant first and second person terms—both pronouns and nouns—often occur in post-verbal position and generally lack a postpositional particle such as wa (“topic”) or ga (“subject”). Although Japanese is typologically considered to be an SOV language, this construction permits elements to be placed after the sentence-final verbal in the spoken language. The examples presented here derive from film dialogues, but it has been attested that identical post-predicate person terms occur frequently in natural talk (e.g., Ono and Suzuki, 1992; Simon, 1989).

A detailed analysis of postposed first and second person pronouns in their contexts of use shows that they can often be correlated with specific discourse-pragmatic and affective functions, not inherent in similar expressions occurring in canonical word order. This observation offers support for Ono and Suzuki (1992), who discuss Japanese word order variability in connection with grammaticalization, and provides a counter-argument to those who have been too eager to promote alleviation of ambiguity or the idea of plain “afterthoughts” as the fundamental functions of postposing. I suggest that such terms can be interpreted to function as indicators of interactional adjustment, in many ways similar to intensifying “affect terminators” (affect keys, i.e., linguistic features that intensify or specify affect function and follow the constructions they modify) (Ochs and Schieffelin, 1989) and sentence-final particles communicating the
speaker’s reinforced appeal to the interlocutor and attitude (self-questioning, assertive, conclusive, etc.) toward the content of his or her utterance.\textsuperscript{15} They occur in a relatively restricted set of utterance types such as self-encouragement, regret, dissatisfaction, reprimand, evaluation and teasing. The pragmatic meaning of postposed person terms is motivated interactionally and can be interpreted solely in real-life communicational contexts of their occurrence (Maynard, 1999).

Let us take a look at some examples of second person terms found in the analyzed films. Example (19) has a sentence-final second person pronoun \textit{anta} ‘you (a familiar variant of \textit{anata})’ and is used to reproach and evaluate the addressee in a negative way.

(19) Genkin ne \textit{anta}. (S: 350)
\hspace{1cm} calculating IP you
\hspace{1cm} ‘You only think of your own interest.’

If we examine the contexts in which sentences such as (19) are spoken, in most cases the second person terms are redundant because the addressee is clear from the context. In assertive expressions pronouns of this type appear overwhelmingly in criticisms, ridicules and other negative evaluations of the addressee. They are employed to convey the speaker’s disapproving stance and, consequently, to put into prominence the negative qualities associated with the addressee by the speaker. Guo (1999: 1122) claims this to be a “unique” characteristic of Mandarin Chinese “right-dislocations”, but, as example (19) illustrates, also in Japanese identical second person expressions frequently accompany strong negative evaluations.

The following example, however, demonstrates that, contrary to the case of Mandarin Chinese as reported by Guo, in Japanese postposed second person pronouns function as indicators of modal adjustment also in positive evaluations of the addressee.

(20) \textit{Erai} wa nee, \textit{anta}... (K: 114)
\hspace{1cm} admirable IP IP you
\hspace{1cm} ‘You’re really admirable...’

\textsuperscript{15} This approach concurs with Fujiwara (1973: 57), who refers to sentence-final personal pronouns occurring in his (dated) data of Japanese dialects as “transformed sentence-final particles” and goes on to explain that creating and establishing new particle forms should be viewed as an ongoing process, influencing the development of Japanese syntax.
Utterances of this type are employed to convey the intensity of the speaker’s admiration and to put into prominence the highly positive qualities linked to the interlocutor by the speaker. (Cf. the first line of example 23: nouns can also appear in the same position.)

The following examples, (21) and (22), are similar to the evaluative sentences (19) and (20). In both examples we have only two people present and anta, produced with some phonological prominence, appears to be employed distinctively for special appeal and intensifying. The fact that the speaker is arguing strongly—although jokingly—with the addressee offers further support for this kind of analysis.¹⁶

(21) Suki na no yo! Horechatta no yo anta! Honhore yo! (B: 57)
like COP IP IP fell in love IP IP you real love IP
‘You like him! I mean you’re really in love with him. It’s real love, I tell you!’

(22) Monpe haku no yo anta. (B: 56)
baggy farmer’s pants wear IP IP you
‘You’ll be wearing monpe, I tell you.’

I argue that what is important in the examples presented here is the

¹⁶ It could of course be argued that the connotation of intensified reproach, admiration and so forth in the examples presented here is not directly linked to postposed pronouns at all, but that it is already there even without them. Translations of Japanese examples of this type usually offer little cues to the discourse-pragmatic significance of terms such as anta in (21) and (22) and they are generally glossed over as simple vocatives, having no direct relation whatsoever to the propositional content and modal meaning of the utterance. The following, genuine example from Ogawa (1999: 127), however, offers strong support for our hypothesis:

which one which one what that boy I GEN type COP-NEG FP FP
Nani itten no yo, anta.
what saying FP FP you
‘Which one? Which one? What? That boy? [He]’s not my type, I am telling you. What are you talking about, you silly.’

Not only is the latter interrogative with a postposed second person pronoun anta ‘you (familiar variant of anata)’ strikingly similar to the examples found in my data, but the accompanying English translation of the term as ‘you silly’ demonstrates that our speculations must be warranted.
effectiveness of the speech. Postposing is an inseparable part of naturally occurring, unplanned talk and the existence of postposed terms in the examples analyzed in this section can be taken to manifest the endeavor of scriptwriters to create natural-sounding dialogues. The unplanned nature of casual conversation works in favour of expressive speech. What is in stake in the presented examples is the “here and now” of the conversational contexts and the speech participants’ need for precise information at any given moment. To add a discourse-predictable overt person term post-verbally may seem superfluous from the perspective of communicative economy (Haiman, 1983), but makes perfect sense from the point of view of communicative effectiveness (Guo, 1999).

3.4. Personal pronouns in linguistic strategies: Framing in discourse

In this final analytic section, I discuss the variation of Japanese pronominal forms, concentrating on occurrences of marked terms and their functions in the dynamics of conversational interaction. Since speakers of Japanese have the option to select pronouns from a paradigmatic set, choosing an unusual term creates meaning. Previously shifts of personal referents have been discussed for example as conventional attributes of the speaker’s psychological and behavioural states, but I suggest that taking a look at what is actually “going on” in the context where shifting terms occur could prove to be a more profitable approach.

In the analysis of data I employ the notion of marking and pick out scenes where speakers are shown to resort to marked (or non-habitual) pronominal forms. A researcher analyzing interaction furthermore needs a tool to label the activities that are being engaged in, in which sense I use Tannen and Wallat’s (1993) notion of “interactive frames”. The concept of ‘frame’ refers to “what is occurring” or “what is going on” in any given situation. Interactants must be aware of within which frame an utterance is intended in order to be able to interpret it correctly. Linguistic and paralinguistic cues guide us in the labeling process, that is, they reveal us whether we and our interlocutors are framing the interaction for example as joking, teasing, fighting or expression of solidarity and intimacy. Due to the various stances or “footings” (Goffman, 1981) participants adopt as the interaction progresses, there is often continuous shifting and evolving in framing. The following example illustrates how shifts from unmarked

---

17 Cf. Martin’s (1975: 1044) remark on the “effective use” of postposition in slogans and public admonitions.
personal pronouns to marked ones can be seen as the kinds of “cues and markers” of footing and frame changes indicated by Goffman.

(23) **speaker:** Fumiko (35, f) (Noriko’s elder brother’s wife)
**addressee:** Noriko (28, f)

**second person terms employed by Fumiko:** *Noriko-san* (FN + suff.) (6), *anata* (pron.) (5), *anta* (pron.) (1)

1 F: Erai wa, *Noriko-san.*
   admirable IP FN-SUFF
   ‘You’re really admirable, Noriko.’
   ( . . . )

2 N: Demo... atashi ga ittattara, uchi no
   but I S end up going-COND home GEN
   hoo doo na no kashira...?
   side how COP NOM IP (‘I wonder’)
   ‘But if I leave, what’s going to happen to everybody at home, I wonder.’

3 F: Sonna koto ki ni shinakute ii no yo.
   like that thing feeling IO do-NEG good IP IP
   Otoosama okaasama, *anata* no shiawase
   father mother you GEN happiness

4 F: dake o kangaetirassharu no yo.
   only DO thinking-HON IP IP
   Sonna koto shinpai shinakute mo ii no yo.
   like that thing worry do-NEG also good IP IP
   ‘You shouldn’t worry about such things. Father and mother are only thinking
   about your happiness. Stop worrying about such things.’

5 N: Dakedo... oneesan taihen da to omou wa, ironnna koto...
   however big sister hard COP QT think IP all kinds things
   ‘But... I think it’ll be hard for you, everything...’

6 F: Uun, heiki yo. Kyoosoo yo. kore kara *anta* to.
   no tranquil IP competition IP this from you with
   ‘No, I’ll be ok. From now on it’ll be a competition with you.’

7 N: Naani?
   what
   ‘What?’

8 F: Yarikuri kyoosoo! Makenai wa yo, atashi.
   running the house competition lose-NEG IP IP I
   ‘Yes, a competition who’ll be able to run the house better. I won’t lose, you know.’

9 N: Atashi mo makenai. (B: 60)
   I also lose-NEG
   ‘Neither will L.’
Norika-san, anata (seriots tone): “Elder sister-in-law worrying” avoids a difficult topic

\[ \text{anata (voice quality, intonation, smile): “Playfulness; solidarity: Mothers and wives”} \]

In Fumiko’s speech, there is only one occurrence of the informal and familiar second person pronoun anata to her sister-in-law Noriko. As a rule, Fumiko is addressing Noriko by employing either Noriko-san (FN + polite suffix -san) or anata (standard polite second person pronoun) all through the movie. (The second person pronouns anata and anata occur strictly as grammatically bound forms, whereas Noriko-san is used mainly in vocative function.)

In example (23), we witness a scene where Noriko and Fumiko are talking about the former’s coming marriage with a certain Kenkichi Yabe, a colleague of Noriko’s elder brother (who is Fumiko’s husband). Kenkichi, being in his 40s, is several years older than Noriko, 28. Kenkichi’s wife died a couple of years ago, leaving him alone with their young daughter Mitsuko. Noriko made the decision to marry Kenkichi alone after a short discussion with his mother, and her family was very upset because she made such an important decision without asking their opinion. In fact, they had been considering another marriage proposal for her. In the scene depicted in extract (23), Fumiko is talking about how worried she and all the other members of the family are about the coming marriage, but Noriko assures her that there is no need to worry. She claims that she knows what she is doing. However, toward the end of the scene the roles seem to be reversed, and it is Noriko who starts worrying about Fumiko and the rest of the family: will they be alright after she is gone? Fumiko tells her not to worry about such things. She will be alright, in fact, after Noriko is married, it will become a competition between the two: which one of them will be able to economize and run the house better, her or Noriko? This is where Fumiko suddenly makes use of anata: Kyooosoo yo, kore kara anata to ‘From now on it’ll be a competition with you’. She says this jokingly, emphasizing a feeling of solidarity and intimacy.

Fumiko’s footing can be interpreted to change accordingly. In the beginning of the episode she is the one doing the “scolding”, that is, expressing her worries
about Noriko’s upcoming marriage as a true oneesan ‘elder sister’ should. (Note that the kinship term oneesan is Noriko’s second person term to Fumiko.) After a while the roles change, and now it is Noriko who takes the role of the worrying character. However, instead of adopting a scolding tone, she underlines her role as the person who should be held responsible for causing problems to Fumiko and the rest of the family by getting married and leaving the house. When she becomes personal and refers directly to the problems her marriage will cause to Fumiko, Fumiko quickly changes the tone of the conversation: the serious “worrying frame” switches to a frame of playful joking. This switch is signaled by the marked use of the familiar second person pronoun anta, as well as paralinguistic clues (voice quality, intonation) and nonverbal communication (smile). Since Noriko will also marry soon, from now on, they will both be wives and mothers. The occurrence of anta coincides with a clear break in the initial frame of the situation: the serious “worrying frame” changes to a frame of joking.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to look at so-called first and second person pronouns occurring in Japanese conversation. It is obvious that some of the questions raised in this investigation could be addressed only in a relatively superficial way. Diverse methods had to be applied and a multitude of areas explored in order to be able to sketch the picture that emerged. My study can no doubt be criticized in that the analyzed data are limited to dialogues depicted in films. Film dialogues differ from naturally occurring conversation in many ways, but, given the complexity of Japanese systems of addressing and referring, I believe that Japanese script writers must give a considerable amount of thought to the manner person terms are used by characters created by them in order be able to produce natural-sounding dialogues.

It has been advanced that so-called personal pronouns do not differ syntactically or functionally from nouns in Japanese and, therefore, should not be considered as a separate category. In this study I attempted to show how this aspect is manifested in their discourse behaviour and that it might, in fact, be profitable to examine Japanese personal pronouns as points on a (non-language-specific) continuum extending from nouns to morphologically distinct pronominal forms. In most cases, the discourse functions of pronouns do not differ from those of nouns in any other aspect than their indexicality. Even as indexical indicators of persons, pronominal forms rely on circumstances existing
outside the linguistic expression itself. In addition, in Japanese the use of indexical expressions by social inferiors toward social superiors is disallowed. The use of 2nd person pronouns is seen as an act of pointing at one’s addressee and this is considered too direct and, therefore, rude. Social superiors are addressed only with names, titles and kinship terms, which are often identical to 3rd person reference terms.

Analysis of personal pronouns and other overt referents in spoken Japanese is an area of Japanese linguistics, which has been neglected in the past. Previous studies concentrate on static sociolinguistic factors (e.g., age, sex, social status) related to these terms, or focus on the anaphoric functions of pronouns in written texts and narratives. This study illustrates that more specific analyses of discourse data are needed in order to comprehend how personal pronouns are used interactionally in spoken discourse and how they function in relation to terms belonging to other categories. What should be stressed are the communicative roles they (and other terms) play in processes of face-to-face interaction. In this paper I referred for example to pronouns used as vocative terms and to postposed personal pronouns, which can be correlated with specific discourse-pragmatic and affective functions, not inherent in similar expressions occurring in canonical word order.

Furthermore, it must be stressed that, in Japanese, selecting one term rather than another from a paradigmatic set generates meaning. This is the reason personal referents lend themselves also to tactical and strategic uses. Shifts from unmarked personal pronouns to marked ones may indicate changes in the way the speaker frames the on-going speech.

Areas that could only be touched upon in this paper, but still need further investigation include the analysis of ellipted personal referents vs. the expression of contrast and emphasis, the notion of personal referent ellipsis in Japanese in general, and indexicality in Japanese conversation. Lately, pragmatic and discourse analytic studies of naturally occurring conversation have gained more popularity in Japanese linguistics and it is my wish that the suggestions outlined in this paper will be specified by further studies.
Appendix

Data sources: Japanese films (and film scripts)
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