

Logophoric first-person terms in Japanese and generalized conversational implicatures

Author(s): Koichi Nishida

Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (2013), pp. 287-299

Editors: Chundra Cathcart, I-Hsuan Chen, Greg Finley, Shinae Kang, Clare S. Sandy, and Elise Stickles

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

Logophoric First-person Terms in Japanese and Generalized Conversational Implicatures

KOICHI NISHIDA

Shimonoseki City University

This article discusses the logophoric reading of first-person terms (FPTs) like *watasi* ‘I’ in Japanese, both in and out of complement clauses, showing that it is a case of what Levinson (2000) calls “generalized conversational implicatures” (GCIs). I will show where, how and why the Gricean Maxim of Quantity can derive the logophoric reading of Japanese FPTs.

This article is organized as follows. Section 1 shows typological evidence for a link between FPTs and logophoric terms. Section 2 focuses on Japanese FPTs occurring in the complement clauses of verbs of communication, developing Hasegawa and Hirose’s (2005) argument that Japanese has two types of FPTs that correspond to two aspects of the speaker’s Self, i.e. the private Self and the public Self. Section 3 deals with Japanese FPTs occurring in article titles, which take the form of noun phrases modified by relative clauses. Section 4 discusses the theoretical implications of this study. Section 5 concludes this article.

1 A Typological Observation

Typologically, there are languages in which FPTs can be used as logophoric terms (cf. Siewierska 2004:203). For example, Schlenker (2003:68) points out that Amharic, a Semitic language in North Central Ethiopia, uses the first-person element in the complement to indicate coreference with the matrix subject, as in (1a), but such a use of the first-person pronoun “I” is unacceptable in English, as in (1b):

- (1) a. *jon jəgna nə-ññ yil-all*
John hero be.PF-1sO 3M.say-AUX.3M
‘John_i says he_i is a hero.’ Literally, ‘John_i says I_i am a hero.’
b. John_i says he_i is a hero.
*John_i says I_i am a hero.

Similar facts are found in Navajo, as noted by Akmajian and Anderson (1970:6) with example (2), and in Punjabi, as noted by Bhatia (2000:645) with (3):

- (2) Mary Jáan 'ayóí 'áníínish'ní yíłní.
'Mary told John that she likes him.' Literally, M. told J., 'I like you.'

- (3) Gurnek_i ne aakhiaa ki mǎi_i jǎãvaagaa.
Gurnek ERG say-PAST that I go-FUT-1 Masculine-SG
'Gurnek_i said that he_i would go' or 'Gurnek_i said that I_j would go.'

These data have a common property in representing the utterance of the original speaker, or the message source referred to by the matrix subject, suggesting that when FPTs are used in the contexts representing the original speaker's utterance, there is a reasonable motivation for them to be used as logophoric terms.

Japanese FPTs, too, can occur in a complement clause to indicate coreference with the third-person matrix subject. Japanese does not formally distinguish between direct discourse and indirect discourse complements; example (4) does not specify whether the complement is a quote or not. In (4), *watasi* in the complement of verbs like *iu* 'say' and *yorokobu* 'be glad' can be coreferential with the matrix subject, creating a direct discourse-like reading that reproduces Hanako's self-reference, but *watasi* in the complement of verbs like *siru* 'know' and *kiku* 'hear' can only refer to the current speaker.

- (4) Hanako_i-wa tugi-wa watasi_i-no deban-da to
Hanako-TOP next-TOP I-GEN turn-COP COMP
{it-teiru/ yorokon-deiru/ *sit-teiru/ *kii-teiru}.
{say-STATE/be-glad-STATE/ know-STATE/ hear-STATE}
'Hanako_i {says/is glad/*knows/*hears} that the next time is her_i turn.'

This shows that the logophoric FPTs occur only with a specific type of verbs.

The contrast in (4) agrees with "the logocentric verb hierarchy," adopted from Stirling (1993:259), who points out that typologically, the higher in rank a given verb is, the more readily it accepts a logophoric term in its complement:

- (5) communication > thought > psychological state > perception

In this hierarchy, verbs of communication are different because they take message sources as subjects. Sells (1987:455) defines the discourse role SOURCE as "the one who makes the report." Here I develop this concept to argue that only an individual who expresses his message in speech can play the message source role. This means that it cannot be played by an individual who thinks about some message in his mind, nor by one who is in a particular psychological state about

it, nor by one who perceives it; these cases do not involve speech, and do not send messages to other people. To make a tentative generalization from the above data, verbs of communication like *iu* and *yorokobu* in Japanese are high in the hierarchy in (5) and so can introduce an FPT as a logophoric marker, which marks the matrix subject as a message source. On the other hand, verbs like *siru* and *kiku* are low in the hierarchy, and are incompatible with logophoric markers.

A similar fact is found with the Mongolian first person genitive *minu* ‘my’ (Siqin, personal communication). In (6), *minu* can be taken as being coreferential with the matrix subject when the verbs are *helju* ‘say’ and *bayarlju* ‘be glad,’ but not when they are *medeju* ‘know’ and *sonoscu* ‘hear.’

- (6) Sicin_i dara-ni minu_i egelje geju {helju-baina/
Sicin next I-GEN turn COMP {say-STATE/
bayarlju-baina/*medeju-baina/*sonoscu-baina}.
be-glad-STATE/*know-STATE/*hear-STATE}
‘Sicin_i {says/is glad/*knows/*hears} that the next time is her_i turn.’

This indicates that the hierarchy in (5) is cross-linguistically valid, and further that logophoricity is conceptually rooted in the reproduction of self-reference as it is verbally expressed in communication by the referent of the matrix subject.

2 Japanese Logophoric First Person Terms

I am going to argue that in light of Japanese data, FPTs are motivated to be used as logophoric terms when they help reproduce the dialogue between the original speaker and the current speaker. My argument makes crucial use of the fact that Japanese has two types of FPTs: one is *zibun*, which refers to what Hirose (2000), Hirose (2002), and Hasegawa and Hirose (2005) call the “private Self,” and the others are terms like *watasi* and *boku*, which refer to what they call the “public Self.” It is shown that the logophoric use of FPTs of the latter type is rooted in their communicative, hearer-oriented nature.

It is clear from the above examples that only the complements of verbs of communication may accept the logophoric FPTs. It might be argued, however, that *yorokobu* in (4) is not a verb of communication, but instead is a verb of psychological state, which is lower in the hierarchy. In fact, it means not just a psychological state of being glad, but is extended to mean the communicative action of ‘being glad with saying that...’ In this extended sense, *yorokobu* is used as a verb of communication which assigns the message source role to the subject. In other words, *yorokobu* can denote an action which accompanies the utterance with which the subject communicates its gladness to other people.

This extension is not available with verbs of perception like *kiku* ‘hear,’ since hearing does not accompany utterance. As far as action verbs can denote actions

that accompany utterance, for example, *warau* ‘laugh’ and *ikigomu* ‘become eager,’ they accept the logophoric FPTs, as in (7). However, *omou* ‘think’ is different. It is a verb of thinking, and is ranked second in the hierarchy in (5).

- (7) Hanako_i-wa tugi-wa watasi_i-no deban-da to
 Hanako-TOP next-TOP I-GEN turn-COP COMP
 {warat-ta/ ikigon-da/ (*)omot-ta}.
 {laugh-PAST/become eager-PAST/ think-PAST}
 ‘Hanako_i {laughed/became eager/(*)thought} (with saying) that the next time was her_i turn.’

In (7), *watasi* in the complement of *omou* can be taken either as being referential to the current speaker or as being coreferential with Hanako. This ambiguity comes from the fact that *omou* can be used either as a verb of thinking or as a verb denoting an action involving utterance, which is paraphrased as ‘saying what one thinks.’ The logophoric *watasi* is compatible only with the latter sense.

When *zibun* is used in place of *watasi* in (4), *zibun* is coreferential with Hanako, irrespectively of whether the complement is taken by a verb of communication or by a verb of perception, as illustrated in (8):

- (8) Hanako_i-wa tugi-wa zibun_i-no deban-da to
 Hanako-TOP next-TOP self-GEN turn-COP COMP
 {it-teiru/ yorokon-deiru/ sit-teiru/ kii-teiru}.
 {say-STATE/ be-glad-STATE/ know-STATE/ hear-STATE}
 ‘Hanako_i {says/is glad/knows/hears} that the next time is her_i turn.’

This is because *zibun* is an inherent logophoric term, and the logophoric reading belongs to its proper meaning. By contrast, there are two pieces of evidence that the logophoric reading of FPTs like *watasi* is a conversational implicature.

First, the logophoric reading of *watasi* is cancelable. Although it is unnatural, it is additionally possible to read *watasi* with *it-teiru* in (4) as being referential to the current speaker rather than as being coreferential with Hanako.

Second, the logophoric reading is non-detachable. In Japanese, FPTs that have the same sense as *watasi* can produce the same logophoric reading. While ‘I’ in English is a pronoun with little descriptive content, each Japanese FPT is a noun which has descriptive content. Historically, *watasi* means ‘private,’ and *boku* means ‘male servant.’ Suzuki (1973/1978) notes that Japanese has a strategy of self-reference, saying that “[you] refer to yourself with the description of the role that you play for your addressee.” This addressee-oriented strategy is characteristic of the speech of adults who address children: because of this, an elementary school teacher refers to himself as *sensei* ‘teacher’ when talking to his pupils and a father refers to himself as *otoosan* ‘father’ when talking to his child.

In this way, Japanese can produce different FPTs from descriptive nouns if the chosen noun denotes the speaker's role for the addressee.

This strategy also holds of these descriptions that are used with verbs of communication to obtain the logophoric reading. In (9), *iu*, but not *omou*, brings about the logophoric reading of descriptive nouns like *sensei* and *otoosan*:

- (9) Ken_i-wa (seito-ni/musuko-ni) tugi-wa {boku_i-no/ sensei_i-no/
 Ken-TOP pupil-to/ son-to next-TOP I-GEN teacher-GEN
 otoosan_i-no} deban-da to {it-teiru/ *omot-teiru}.
 father-GEN turn-COP COMP {say-STATE/think-STATE}
 'Ken_i{says (to his pupils/to his son)/*thinks}that the next time is his_i turn.'

This contrast occurs because, unlike *omou*, *iu* is a verb of hearer-directed communication which can readily reproduce the communicative situation in which the subject, Ken, refers to himself as *sensei* or *otoosan* in addition to *boku* when addressing his pupils or his son.

So, what is the sense that is shared by *watasi*, *boku* and *sensei*, but not by *zibun*? I argue that this question can be answered in terms of the presence or absence of the hearer(s) with whom the speaker intends to communicate.

In a series of articles (Hirose 2000, Hirose 2002, and Hasegawa and Hirose 2005), Hirose has argued that the speaker's Self has two different aspects; one is the private Self and the other the public Self. The private Self is the speaker as the subject of thinking who uses his words to express his thoughts and feelings. On the other hand, the public Self is the speaker as the subject of communicating who uses his words to communicate with his hearer(s). Specifically, Hasegawa and Hirose (2005) argue that the two contrastive aspects of the speaker's Self correspond to two types of FPTs in Japanese: one is *zibun*, which denotes the private Self as a thinker having no intention to communicate with others, and the other is a set of terms like *watasi*, *boku*, *otoosan*, *sensei* and so on, which express the public Self having the intention to communicate with others.

Hasegawa and Hirose (2005:238-239) point out that there is a difference in meaning between (10a) with *zibun* and (10b) with *watasi*. Both (10a-b) are intended to mean 'my consciousness of being a genius.'

- (10) a. zibun-wa tensai da to-iu isiki
 self-TOP genius COP COMP-say consciousness
 Literally, 'the consciousness: I'm a genius'
 'the consciousness of being a genius'
 b. ?? watasi-wa tensai da to-iu isiki
 I-TOP genius COP COMP-say consciousness
 Literally, 'the consciousness of the fact that I am a genius'
 'the consciousness of being a genius'

To cite Hasegawa and Hirose's argument:

Example (10a) is perfectly acceptable; it is a self-contained expression in which *zibun* refers to the subject of consciousness, whoever s/he actually is. By contrast, (10b) sounds odd because *watasi* is a public expression, presupposing an addressee, and hence should not appear in a description of consciousness proper. Public-expression pronouns are used by the speaker to refer to herself only when she has a communicative intention. Thus, if (10b) is used in a communicative situation in which the speaker reports her own consciousness to another person, it becomes acceptable, e.g. (11).
(Hasegawa and Hirose 2005:239)

- (11) Watasi-ga {zibun/ watasi}-wa tensai-da to-iu
 I-NOM self/ I -TOP genius-COP QUOT-say
 isiki-o motta-no-wa tyoodo
 consciousness-ACC had-Nominalizer-TOP just
 sono-toki desi-ta.
 that-time COP(Polite Form)-PAST
 Literally, 'It was at just that time that I acquired the consciousness:
 I'm a genius.'
 'It was just at that point in time that I became aware of my genius.'

Hasegawa and Hirose note that "the use of *watasi* in (11) is licensed by the speaker as a communicating agent (i.e. the outer, public Self), whereas (10b) lacks such a communicative context and therefore brings about anomaly."

I argue that this hearer-oriented nature of the public, or communicative Self allows for the ambiguity of FPTs like *watasi*: they are used both for self-reference in which the current speaker refers to himself and for logophoric terms which represent the message source expressed in the same sentences in which they are used. It is shown that the two uses are distinguishable in terms of the Gricean Maxim of Quantity, and that their logophoric use can be derived as a GCI.

The communicative FPTs characteristically require the presence of hearers. Since message source and hearer make a pair in dialogue, this means that the referent of a given communicative FPT is the individual from whom the hearer receives its message. In other words, in order to identify the FPT's referent, it is first necessary to identify who the hearer is. It might appear that hearers are identified with minimum effort, for they are simply assumed to be other people who are faced with the current speaker. But this is not always the case, and this assumption is one effect of the second submaxim of the Maxim of Quantity.

According to Grice (1975:45), the Maxim of Quantity consists of two complementary submaxims, as in (12):

- (12) a. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
- b. Do not make your contribution more informative than is required.

In the current context, the Maxim of Quantity is understood in terms of the following two instructions:

- (13) a. Provide enough information about who the hearer is for the message source expressed by the FPT for the current purposes of the exchange.
- b. Provide the minimum information about who the hearer is for the message source expressed by the FPT.

The idea is that the speaker who introduces a message source other than himself flouts the minimum effort requirement provided by the second instruction in that he lets hearers make an otherwise unnecessary inference about who the relevant hearer is, which gives rise to the FPT's logophoric reading as an implicature.

In the default case, a communicative FPT like *watasi* is used in line with the second instruction in (13b) to refer to the current speaker. The hearer(s) can be identified with the minimum information provided by his presence. Unless otherwise specified, the speaker is a message source for the person he addresses, and the hearers are conventionally assumed to be others who are faced with him.

In the marked case, on the other hand, the speaker flouts the second instruction to observe the first one in (13). In (4), for example, he introduces a message source other than himself, i.e. Hanako, who requires her hearer to communicate with. This hearer cannot be identified with the person faced with the current speaker, since there is no reason to suppose that the person faced with Hanako is the same as the person faced with him. This militates against the hearer-identification convention provided by the second instruction, which leads the hearers to infer that the first instruction instead comes into operation.

The presence of the matrix clause with a verb of communication shows that the current speaker is a reporter of the message from the matrix subject, and is a hearer from its point of view. On the assumption that the message source expressed by the FPT in this context talks to the current speaker, hearers can infer that the FPT is coreferential with the message source referred to by the matrix subject. In this way, the logophoric reading of an FPT like *watasi* can be derived as an implicature. Since this reading is generally given to FPTs for the communicative Self used in the contexts which introduce message sources other than the current speaker, it is a GCI. Thus, the following generalization holds:

- (14) In Japanese, FPTs for the communicative Self can be diverted as logophoric terms when the FPT used stands for an individual who takes the current speaker as a hearer of its message.

When the original message source's hearer is expressed, as in (9), the current speaker still is a reporter, and may be an indirect hearer of that source: he may hear its message, not directly, but indirectly from the relevant hearer expressed.

In sum, Japanese FPTs like *watasi* and *boku* (but not *zibun*) refer to message sources who talk to their hearers. They refer to the current speaker when he himself is a message source for his hearer, but not when he is a reporter of another message source. This is because reporters talk about what they have heard from original speakers to introduce them as being more important message sources than they are. In this sense, a reporter is a hearer from the original message source's point of view. In the context where there is enough information that the current speaker is a reporter of another message source, the FPTs for the communicative Self are taken to be referential to that message source rather than to him.

In what follows, the same arguments can be reproduced in relation to the FPTs used in titles of magazine articles, where there are no verbs of communication taking complement clauses, but are only stylistic conventions that the article titles introduce the main characters of the articles who act as message sources.

3 Logophoric First Person Terms in Article Titles

In Japanese, logophoric FPTs can also occur in article titles. The title in (15) is found in a book magazine that features the favorite books of famous people like Rena Tanaka. In (15), with *erabu* 'select' and *okuru* 'offer,' *watasi* is taken to be coreferential with Rena, but with *sitteiru* and *kiku*, it is not.

- (15) Tanaka Rena_i-ga {erabu/okuru/*sit-teiru / *kiku} watasi_i-no
 Tanaka Rena-NOM {select/offer / know-STATE/ hear} I-GEN
 aidoku-syo
 favorite-book
 'Her_i favorite book that Rena Tanaka_i {selects/sends as a gift/*knows/
 *hears about}'

As reflected in the gloss, the coreferential reading of *watasi* in (15) is expressed as the cataphoric reading of *her* in English. As for their lexical meanings, *erabu* and *okuru*, as well as *siru* and *kiku*, are not verbs of communication. But the main character's activities in a magazine article conventionally include selecting and sending her favorite book as a gift, but not knowing or hearing about it, so as to make her a message source for the readers (cf. Corazza et al. 2002).

Article titles are the contexts which are conventionally supposed to introduce

message sources, and in this sense, they bring about similar effects to verbs of communication. In other words, the writer of an article title featuring a message source may act as a reporter, and hence a hearer of that message source. As in (16), in article titles, the logophoric FPTs are compatible only with the verbs which express what the main character conventionally does as a message source:

- (16) Tanaka Rena_i-ga {susumeu/ omoidasu/ *sain-suru/
 Tanaka Rena-NOM {recommend/ recollect/ write signature on/
 *kopii-suru} watasi_i-no aidoku-syo
 photocopy} I-GEN favorite-book
 ‘Her_i favorite book that Rena Tanaka_i {recommends/recollects/
 *writes signature on/*photocopies}’

There is a basic difference between the actions by which the main character can send her message with an utterance and those by which she cannot. In a magazine article, the main character is conventionally expected to talk, recommending or recollecting memories of her favorite book, from which the reader can receive messages from her. By contrast, neither writing her signature on it nor photocopying it is a conventional action involving an utterance, and so the reader cannot regard as a message source the person who writes her signature on a book or who photocopies it. Thus, in (16), the logophoric reading is not available with *sain-suru* ‘write signature on’ nor with *kopii-suru* ‘photocopy,’ and the *watasi* with them can only be taken to be referential to the current speaker.

The present analysis provides a natural account of the fact that the communicative FPTs can occur by themselves in the title of a TV or radio program. As in (17a), they are especially appropriate for the request programs in which the listeners or viewers can participate as message sources, but not for those in which they just receive information from TV or radio:

- (17) a. Boku-no ik-kyoku, watasi-no ik-kyoku
 I-GEN one-song, I-GEN one-song
 ‘my (favorite) one song, my (favorite) one song’
 b. ??Zibun-no ik-kyoku
 self-GEN one-song
 ‘my (favorite) one song’ [Intended]

In (17a), *boku* and *watasi* are taken to stand for each of the listeners who have sent their requests to the program, probably by saying “I want to listen to this song or that song.” In this sense, each listener is a message source, and can be represented by the FPTs for the communicative Self.

It is now clear why the FPTs work as part of titles of request programs, but the inherent logophoric term *zibun* does not, as in (17b). The *zibun*-version in (17b)

can also be used as a title of a radio or TV program, but this is not a title of a request program. Instead, this is appropriate as a title of a program in which only one guest comes to talk about his or her favorite song. This is because the thinking Self represented by *zibun* is part of the monologue in which the subject speaks just for himself, but the communicative FPTs are part of the dialogue in which the subject talks with others, and acts as a message source towards the addressee. Request is specific to dialogue, and cannot be made in monologue.

4 Theoretical Implications

The present account has a close relation to Kuno (1972), who argues that the logophoric third person pronoun in an indirect discourse complement is derived from the underlying first person pronoun in a direct discourse complement. In his direct discourse analysis, the logophoric pronoun, *he* in (18a), for example, is derived from the first person ‘I’ in the direct discourse in (18b):

- (18) a. John_i expects that he_i will be elected.
b. John expects, “I will be elected.”

Since the speaker (actually, the thinker) refers to himself with a pronoun, but not with a name when he thinks of his internal feeling, the logophoric pronoun cannot be replaced by a name, either. Thus, as in (19), in the complement placed in the subject of a passivized sentence, too, the pronoun wins over the name as far as the complement represents John’s internal feeling:

- (19) a. That he_i will be elected is expected by John_i.
b. *That John_i will be elected is expected by him_i.

When applied to Japanese, Kuno (1972:193) points out that the logophoric third person pronoun is realized by *zibun*, as in:

- (20) John_i-wa zibun_i-ga toosen-suru koto-o kitaisi-teiru.
John-TOP self-NOM be elected COMP-ACC expect-STATE
‘John_i expects that he_i will be elected.’

However, Kuno does not, and need not, deal with other FPTs in Japanese. As Kuno himself notes, in his direct discourse analysis, the complement clause represents the direct internal feeling of the matrix subject, which, in our terms, belongs to the subject’s monologue rather than to its dialogue with others. Thus, the underlying first person pronoun for the logophoric pronoun has only to denote the Self as a thinker who has no intention to communicate with others.

By contrast, my account is based on the subject’s dialogue in which he com-

municates with others by referring to himself with FPTs like *watasi* or *boku*. As *boku* is specified for a male who talks with people to whom he is expected to lower himself, these FPTs stand for, and allow the hearer or reader to infer, the personal relations between the subject and his addressee(s).

Because the logophoric reading of the FPTs is a GCI attached, not to the FPTs as such, but to the function of identifiable message sources, it arises in the complement of verbs of communication and in the article titles; both contexts are used to express the topic referent as a message source.

On the basis of Amharic examples like (1a), Schlenker (2003) argues that attitude verbs like ‘say that...’ involve what Kaplan (1977) calls “the monster operator,” by which the deictic center is shifted from the current speaker to the speaker of the reported speech act. It is true that attitude verbs such as verbs of communication in (5) offer the simplest context about which the hearer (or reader) can assume the presence of an independent speaker other than the current speaker. As we have seen, however, the monster operator’s effects are not unique to attitude verbs, but also occur in contexts in which a message source is introduced to show its presence in dialogue. This means that the monster operator can be pragmatically analyzed as the hearer’s conventional inference that, since the presence of an independent message source implies the presence of an independent ego (cf. Lyons 1982), there must be another individual in first person, as distinguished from the current speaker.

According to Clements (1975:141), logophoric pronouns are employed “to distinguish reference to the individual whose speech, thoughts, or feelings are reported or reflected in a given linguistic context, from reference to other individual.” However, the Japanese data show that there is a difference between cases where logophoric terms are used to refer to the individual whose speech is reported and those where they are used to refer to the individual whose thoughts or feelings are reported. An individual’s speech can develop into dialogue, but her thoughts or feelings cannot. Since the Japanese FPTs for the communicative Self are based on dialogue, they can occur only in the first cases.

5 Conclusion

Japanese FPTs are different in type from English ‘I’ in that the first person referent is the current speaker in default cases, but it may be the topic individual who qualifies as a message source in the local context, and thus the FPT in question can be diverted into logophoric terms in that context. I have shown that these two cases are distinguished in terms of the Maxim of Quantity, and that the logophoric reading of a given communicative FPT is derived as a GCI. When the current speaker uses an FPT for self-reference, he makes dialogue with other(s) to whom he talks. When he uses it as a logophoric term, on the other hand, he reproduces dialogue between him and the original message source to whom he is

a hearer. In the former use, Japanese communicative FPTs are deictic terms whose deictic center is the current speaker, but in the latter use, they may be deictics whose deictic center is relativized to who the hearer is. This suggests that while the meaning of the Japanese FPTs is decomposed into the Self and the message source role, but can be free from the current turn of speech, the meaning of first person pronouns like English 'I' can be decomposed into the Self and the current turn of speech, but is underspecified as to the message source role.

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to the following people for their valuable comments and suggestions: Yukio Hirose, Yoko Hasegawa, Minoru Nakau, Atsuro Tsubomoto, Haruhiko Yamaguchi, Russell Lee-Goldman, Shiao Wei Tham, Reiko Kataoka, Elizabeth Koier, Chie Fukada, Shun Kudo, Manabu Kusayama, Hiroaki Konno, Masaru Kanetani and Siqin. Note that, without any sexist connotations, I use a masculine pronoun like *he* as a gender-neutral form to refer back to a person whose sex is irrelevant. The remaining inadequacies are my own. This work was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) 21720134 from the Japan Society of the Promotion of Science.

References

- Akmajian, Adrian, and Stephen Anderson. 1970. On the Use of Fourth Person in Navajo, or Navajo Made Harder. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 36:1-8.
- Bhatia, Tej K. 2000. Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Punjabi. In B. C. Lust, K. Wali, J. W. Gair and K. V. Subbarao, eds., *Lexical Anaphors and Pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages: A Principled Typology*, 637-714. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Clements, George N. 1975. The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10:141-177.
- Corazza, Eros, William Fish and Jonathan Gorvett. 2002. Who is I? *Philosophical Studies* 107:1-21.
- Grice, H. Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3, Speech Acts*, 41-58. New York: Academic Press.
- Hasegawa, Yoko and Yukio Hirose. 2005. What the Japanese Language Tells Us about the Alleged Japanese Relational Self. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25:219-251.

Logophoric First-person Terms in Japanese

- Hirose, Yukio. 2000. Public and Private Self as Two Aspects of the Speaker: A Contrastive Study of Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32:1623-1656.
- Hirose, Yukio. 2002. Viewpoint and the Nature of the Japanese Reflexive *Zibun*. *Cognitive Linguistics* 13:357-401.
- Kaplan, David. 1977/1989. Demonstratives: An Essay on the Semantics, Logic, Metaphysics, and Epistemology of Demonstratives and Other Indexicals. In J. Almog, J. Perry and H. Wettstein, eds., *Themes from Kaplan*, 481-563. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1972. Pronominalization, Reflexivization, and Direct Discourse. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3:161-195.
- Levinson, Stephen, C. 2000. *Presumptive Meanings: The Theory of Generalized Conversational Implicature*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Lyons, John. 1982. Deixis and Subjectivity: Loquor, Ergo Sum? In R. J. Jarvella and W. Klein eds., *Speech, Place, and Action*, 101-124. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A Plea for Monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:29-120.
- Sells, Peter. 1987. Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18:445-479.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stirling, Lesley 1993. *Switch-Reference and Discourse Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Suzuki, Takao. 1973. *Kotoba to Bunka*. Tokyo: Iwanami. Also Published as *Words in Context*, trans. by A. Miura, 1978. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Koichi Nishida
Shimonoseki City University
2-1-1 Daigaku-cho, Shimonoseki-shi
Yamaguchi 751-8510

nishida-k@shimonoseki-cu.ac.jp