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PREFACE

For centuries, the Japanese lived in a diglossic condition with Chinese writing as the highly regarded formal (H) variety and various Japanese regional dialects as low colloquial (L) varieties. The two were mutually exclusive and had different purposes: the former for official documents, poetry and formal text-based fiction exercised by the educated male class; and the latter for everyday conversation and illustrated colloquial stories read by women, children and less educated men. Thus there were several genres of literature, each catering for specific readership.

That changed in the late 19th century: with modernization, came the search for a new writing style that could be understood by the majority of Japanese and have an immediacy to people’s lives. This became an urgent mission for both government and writers. It was a concerted effort to create a new writing style known as the genbunitchi (unification of speech and writing) movement, and took place around the turn of the 20th Century.

Genbunitchi was a large-scale writing reform involving many factors and a few decades of trial and error, for which the whole picture is difficult to grasp. Therefore, this thesis focuses on third person pronouns (3PPs) as one aspect of this change, with the work of Natsume Soseki as the main case study. While studies on Japanese personal pronouns are numerous, they tend to focus on discourse situations where first and second pronouns are more prominent because of the overwhelming presence of honorifics. This study is different in that it attempts to fill the gap in the field of historical and linguistic investigation of Japanese 3PPs. It sheds new light on the significance of Soseki as a writer who lived in this very important period of transition and whose writing is one of the clearest indicators of change. It also makes full use of recent technological advances for corpus-based investigation.

Although political and social issues are of great importance when dealing with the Meiji and Taishō periods, a large volume of literature on these has already been published including Howland (2002), Najita (1993 and 1974) and Harootunian (1988, 1980 and 1970). Works in these fields and that of honorifics are referred to where relevant. However, it does not pursue these subjects in any depth because of the existence of already extensive literature. Readers who are interested in them should refer to the above-mentioned books and associated references. Also excluded are gender issues that could have significant implications but their inclusion would certainly have overstretched the scope of the thesis and probably diluted the work as presented.
ABSTRACT

This thesis follows the formation of modern colloquial novel writing in Japan with a focus on third person pronouns (3PPs) as a component of wider writing reform. Their transformation presents a small but pivotal model to shed significant light on the whole complex process of reform.

Part One of the thesis is an explanation and elaboration of the theoretical background. It starts with the historical significance of the period as a transition from feudal to modern, and follows the development of Japanese personal pronouns with reference to English equivalents. The theory of grammaticalization is explained as the main theoretical base, and corpus linguistics as the vital investigative tool. Comprehensive reference to existing research from several fields highlights the multidisciplinary approach of the thesis. It attempts to construct a model for historical investigation of language with a broad perspective that combines useful theories and methods extracted from related disciplines.

Part Two is a systematic exploration of the change in use of 3PPs (in particular, kare 3PPs) by way of a Case Study. This focuses upon the Meiji writer, Natsume Soseki, and is a critical investigation of the growth and transformation of 3PPs in his work when viewed against the theoretical background of Part One. Soseki’s use of kare 3PPs demonstrates that the direction of change moved consistently towards that of grammaticalization: from ‘marked’ to ‘unmarked’, from ‘rare’ to ‘frequent’ and from ‘specific’ to ‘general’.

Further comparisons with other writers give a larger and longer perspective of the change. Contrary to the notion of 3PP as a product of the Meiji era through contact with the West, it shows that the change was already underway long before with kanbun as the H variety playing an important role in the adoption of kare 3PPs. The Western influence was not the cause but one of several factors that accelerated the change. It also depicts a clear S-curve of diachronic change in the use of the kare 3PPs with Soseki at the peak of the curve.

The thesis concludes that 3PP change in Soseki’s novels conforms to the characteristics of grammaticalization with their frequency increase, generalising function, widening of the referent range and the loss of semantic component. More important, it demonstrates the complexity of the change covering other components such as individual tendencies of writers, the orchestrated and institutionalised control by government, wider shifts in social structure, and the role of popular media. Further it presents a practical framework for a corpus-based historical investigation.
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### List of special names and terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>baihua</td>
<td>Chinese colloquial fiction popularised in the Song dynasty. Examples: 水浒伝, 西遊記</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chokuyaku</td>
<td>Direct translation, word-for-word translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gabunai</td>
<td>Elegant Japanese style writing represented by the kana writing in the Heian period (984-1192)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genbunitchi</td>
<td>The unification of speech and writing/ modern colloquial Japanese writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gesaku</td>
<td>Popular fiction of the late Edo period (19th century) such as kibyōshi, gōkan, yomihon, sharebon, kokkeibon and ninjōbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gikobun</td>
<td>A writing style modelled on the Heian kana writing and practised by Edo nationalist scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gōkan</td>
<td>Popular picture novels with more than ten volumes bound together to deal with complex stories. They are closer to yomihon in content, but their forms follow the tradition of picture novel with illustrations on each page. (Famous writer: Ryūtei Tanehiko.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kana</td>
<td>Syllabic writing systems developed in Japan that are used to express the sounds of Japanese. Two sets of kana, hiragana and katakana, are used in the present-day Japanese – the former mainly for grammatical terms and the latter for loan words of Western origin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanbun</td>
<td>Texts written only with kanji including Japanese style kanbun and modern Chinese writing but normally it refers to Chinese classical writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanbun kundoku</td>
<td>Japanese way of reading Chinese classical texts with additional grammatical items but without changing the original composition of the texts. This method emerged in the Heian period, was practiced by the educated male class for many centuries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanbun kundokutai</td>
<td>A formal writing style based on kanbun kundoku with semantic words in kanji and grammatical terms in kana, often used by male writers in the Meiji period for political and social commentaries, and newspaper editorials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanbuntai</td>
<td>Chinese style writing consisting entirely of kanji characters, usually composed by Japanese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kangaku</td>
<td>Studies of Chinese culture (philosophy, thoughts, literature, history, language and art). Practised by the educated Japanese male class. In its narrow sense, studies of Chinese classics such as Confucius, Mao Tsu and Lao Tsu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanji</td>
<td>The ideographs of ancient Chinese origin (some are created in Japan) that are still used in China, Taiwan and Japan. Chinese characters.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kango</td>
<td>Terms originated in Chinese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kobanashi</td>
<td>Simple and funny stories told by professional story-tellers in the Edo period – entertainment for commoners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kokkeibon</td>
<td>Edo colloquial stories with humorous portrayal of common people dominated by dialogue and characterised by realistic expressions. Writers: Jippensha ikku, Shikitei Sanba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninjōbon</td>
<td>Love stories of ordinary citizens disguised as moral stories that are carried through mainly with dialogue. Writer: Tamenaga Shunsui.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ôbun kundoku</td>
<td>Japanese way of reading western texts practised in the Meiji period. Basically the same method as kanbun kundoku.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rangaku</td>
<td>Studies of European science, technology and culture via Dutch media in the Edo period. Main areas of contribution are medicine, astronomy, geography and social systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharebon</td>
<td>Novels based in the pleasure quarters in the mid-Edo period. Stories progress with conversations between courtesans and their clients, and with detailed and realistic expressions. Santō Kyōden is the most famous writer of this genre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the <em>kare</em> 3PPs</td>
<td>Kare (he), kanojo (she) and karera (they)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the <em>ko-so-a</em> 3PPs</td>
<td>Includes 18 3PPs: kore, sore and are; and combinations of the demonstratives kono, sono, and ano (roughly translated as this, that (near you), that (over there)) + the nouns hito or kata (person), yatsu (guy), oloko (man) and onna (woman). (e.g. konohito, sonohito and anohito).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>translationese</td>
<td>Translation-specific language, which refers to linguistic features that are either specific to translation or occur with a significantly higher or lower frequency in translations than in target-language originals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wabun</td>
<td>Traditional Japanese writing as distinct from <em>kanbun</em>, <em>kanbuntai</em>, <em>kanbun kundokutai</em> and modern Japanese writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yomihon</td>
<td>Formal narrative prose (text-based stories as distinct from picture books) written in formal Chinese (<em>kanbun kundoku</em>) or formal Japanese (<em>wabun</em>) style. Writers: Tsuga Teishō, Ueda akiyuki, Takizawa Bakin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**List of abbreviations**

1. **Codes used for reference to Soseki’s works.**
   - LON 1 1901 *London shōsoku* (Letters from London)
   - LON 2 1915 *London shōsoku* (Letters from London)
   - NEKO 1905 *Wagahai wa neko dearu* (I Am a Cat)
   - BOTC 1906 *Botchan* (Young Master)
   - GUBI 1906 *Gubijinsō* (A Peony)
   - COFU 1907 *Kōfu* (A Miner)
   - SAN 1908 *Sanshirō* (Sanshirō)
   - SORE 1908 *Sorekara* (And Then)
   - MON 1909 *Mon* (The Gate)
   - HIGA 1911 *Higan sugi made* (Until the Equinox)
   - KOJI 1913 *Kōjin* (A Passer-by)
   - KOKO 1914 *Kokoro* (The Heart)
   - MICH 1915 *Michikusa* (Detour)
   - MEI 1916 *Meian* (Light and Darkness)

2. **General abbreviations and symbols**
   Parts of speech, cases, tenses and other grammatical terms are referred to by their usual abbreviations.

   - 1PP  first person pronoun
   - 2PP  second person pronoun
   - 3PP  third person pronoun
   - G1   periphrases
   - G2   semi-bound forms like function words and clitics
   - G3   affixes such as derivational morphology that changes the grammatical class of the stem
   - L1   partially fixed lexical phrases
   - L2   complex semi-idiosyncratic lexical forms
   - L3   simplexes and maximally unanalysable idiosyncratic lexical forms
   - >    becomes... (etymology) + characteristic of
   - <    derived from... (etymology) - not characteristic of
3. Notes for Soseki's novels:
CD-ROM ban Shinchō bunko Meiji no bungō (1997) is used for the initial frequency count of pronouns in Soseki's novels.

Text format of Soseki's novels in Aozora bunko's collection (www.aozora.gr.jp) is used for further count of pronouns in dialogue and narrative.

For page numbers of quotations and examples, Shinchō bunko series are used, unless otherwise indicated.

Notes for conventions
1. Historical periods referred in the thesis are based on standard names and dates as shown below.

   **Early Japan**
   Yamato       350-710

   **Classical Japan**
   Nara         710-794
   Heian        794-1192

   **Middle Ages**
   Kamakura     1192-1333
   Muromachi    1334-1573

   **Pre-Modern Japan**
   Azuchi-Momoyama 1573-1603
   Edo or Tokugawa 1603-1867

   **Modern Japan**
   Meiji        1868-1912
   Taishō       1912-1926
   Shōwa        1926-1989
   Heisei       1989 -present

2. Japanese names are given surname first followed by a personal name (e.g. Natsume Soseki rather than Soseki Natsume) following the Japanese convention.

3. Long vowel sounds in Japanese words and names have been indicated with a macron as, for example, in *The Taishō period*, except in widely known words such as Tokyo and Soseki.

4. Historical and technical terms are italicised, e.g. *yomihon, kanbun*. Romanisation in brackets typically indicates pronunciations of Japanese terms, e.g. 彼 (kare), 他 (ta). Chinese characters without romanisation usually mean that either there are multiple or no known pronunciations, e.g. 彼男 (can be read as are, kare, ano otoko, kano otoko, aitsu, etc).

5. Efforts are made to translate titles of Japanese novels into English to assist the reader. Where English translations exist, their titles are given rather than my translations, which are purposely faithful to the original.

6. English translations of Japanese texts quoted in the thesis are all mine unless otherwise indicated.
Introduction

We emphasized the importance of pronouns as indicators of the complex relationships between selves and the societies these selves live in.
(Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 47)

The third person pronouns (3PPs), kare (he), kanojo (she) and karera (they), occupy awkward positions in Japanese. There is a group of writers and scholars, who claim that they are neologisms created through translation of Western texts, and therefore they are not really Japanese and their uses should be restricted. However, at a colloquial level, less attention is paid to their origin or authenticity and their use has been steadily increasing both in frequency and productivity. This increase in frequency started in the late 19th century and two main factors are advanced as the main causes: contact with Western languages and modern Japanese writing reform (genbunitchi).

There are many indicators of the influence of Western languages on the use of 3PPs in Japanese at this time. For example, Mori Ogai and Natsume Soseki, the two prominent writers of the Meiji period (1868-1912), were both educated in Western languages as well as having studied in Europe. Their writing during their stays in Europe show much higher frequencies of the 3PPs than that before and immediately after their trips. In addition, the first two decades of the Meiji period saw unprecedented volumes of translation from Western texts and young writers of this and the following periods grew up reading translations that had many more tokens of 3PPs than normal Japanese writing of the time (e.g. Morita Shiken's translations). Thus the interference from Western languages on Japanese was underway.

As for the writing reform, the existence of two mutually exclusive types of Japanese, Chinese style writing (kanbun) as a formal and High variety, and numerous regional dialects as colloquial and Low varieties, in a traditionally diglossic society presents added dimension and complexity to the language change. By the end of the Edo period (1603-1867), the gap between the two types had grown so wide that it was difficult to write as one spoke or thought. Therefore, genbunitchi was an attempt to
bridge the gap between the two and its main focus was on narrative writing. This was because in the previous Edo period, gesaku (popular fiction) writers had already managed to colloquialise the dialogue part of novels but the narrative part had continued to be written in a formal style. However, the creation of a new style for narrative proved problematic for most writers. The difficulty was ingrained in a language that had a complex honorific system that made it almost impossible to offer a neutral and objective narration. Hierarchy and honorific values are often expressed by numerous personal pronouns and sentence endings. Therefore, these were the elements that had to be changed. For a while (in the 1880s and 1890s), there were various experiments in the literary professions and many writers struggled to find a sentence ending that was suited to narrative before finally settling on the ta-ending (which also indicates the past tense) with a relatively low honorific value.

While the introduction of ta solved the problem of expressing neutral statement in narrative writing, it created another problem. Traditionally, the third person referent (subject, object, etc.) of a sentence was indirectly expressed by a variety of sentence endings: in other words, it was indicated by the honorific value of a particular sentence ending. The uniform sentence ending with ta eliminated this function and created the need for more explicit topic, subject and object. This caused the previously sparsely used personal pronouns to become more frequent.

These were not independent phenomena but closely intertwined and interactive processes that are difficult to identify individually. The frequency increase of the 3PPs caused by language contact, writing reform and some other factors has been a concern among scholars for some time. However, the majority of existing research on personal pronouns is concerned mainly with the honorific function of these, which is understandable considering the extent to which honorifics permeate Japanese. It is nevertheless one-sided and fails to explain vital questions raised here such as: why translations contain more 3PPs than normal Japanese writing; why 3PPs are concentrated in the narrative part of a novel; why they have increased their frequency and variety; and why, in modern writing, 3PPs are often used even when

---

1 To be precise, auxiliary verbs and particles that are attached to verb stems indicate a variety of functions that include person. Japanese is a verb-final language, therefore the sentence ending often indicates these functions.
the referents are already known to the readers. There has been very little research to show the process of 3PP change and the rate of increase with empirical data in relation to the wider change, namely *genbunitchi*. Hence this work, the intention of which is as follows:

1) to establish and explain theories and methods for the historical investigation of Japanese 3PPs;
2) to demonstrate how developmental stages of 3PPs display distinctive characteristics and a cline of a grammatical progression (grammaticalization) over the recent past;
3) to show how 3PPs have permeated modern Japanese writing and speech in a most confused and confusing manner regardless of the structure of Japanese language itself; and
4) to find the connection between the 3PP change and the wider language changes that were occurring simultaneously at the turn of the 20th century.

To do this, there are two Parts to the Thesis: the first may be termed ‘theory’ and the second ‘application’.

Within Part One, Chapter 1 traces the history and definition of 3PPs. It forms a more elaborate introduction, painting the historical backdrop against which the thesis is set. Then, having introduced in Chapter 1 the development of the Japanese pronoun system, Chapter 2 focuses on the theory of grammaticalization that explains general tendencies of language change. The chapter extracts from prominent scholars’ work (e.g. Bybee 2001, Hopper & Traugott 2003, Brinton & Traugott 2005), and summarises key concepts of relevance. It also explains methods of corpus linguistics that are employed as an investigative tool in the thesis. Chapter 3, with reference to existing research, constructs a model approach that combines a number of useful theories and methods from related disciplines and areas of study.

Although the focus here may be the development of the 3PPs in literary writing and the process of their grammaticalization, the discussion cannot restrict itself entirely to this. Change in 3PPs may be an important factor in providing a model and explanations for other changes. In particular, the creation of sub-categories (e.g.
*kanojo*, female singular; *kanojora*, female plural), generalization of meaning, expansion of reference and shift from writing to speech are not unique to pronoun change, and are linked to other aspects of language and social interaction. Hence, while maintaining the focus on 3PPs and grammaticalization, Part One draws threads from other related areas of historical and socio-linguistic investigation. These cross-disciplinary approaches provide the framework against which the development and changing form of 3PPs can be observed.

Part Two then places the spotlight on a particular novelist – Natsume Soseki. The intention is to shed light on the process of change in 3PP use through the analysis of his writing. The role of *kanbun* (Chinese style writing) in the development of the 3PPs, *kare, kanojo* and *karera*, against the common notion of them being products of translations from Western languages is the general issue: Soseki was educated in both *kanbun* and English and his novels have particular status in Japanese literature. The period over which he was writing (1901-1916) coincides with the writing reform and the adoptive process of 3PPs is clearly observable in his colloquial writing.

Soseki is a particularly appropriate case study for several reasons:

1. Soseki’s life parallels the period of change from a feudal to modern society.
2. Soseki’s education in Chinese and English and his colloquial writing style represent both the diglossic and contact situations and the shift from a formal style to a colloquial style of writing around the turn of the 20th century.
3. the serialized publication of Soseki’s novels as daily installment over ten years demonstrates the consistency and progression of his writing, and is therefore suitable for diachronic study of language change.
4. Soseki’s keen eye for language as an academic and the up-to-date nature of his colloquial expressions make his novels good sources for linguistic investigation.
5. the large circulation of the *Asahi* newspaper for which Soseki was writing indicates his popularity and potential influence on readers.
6. the availability of his novels in an electronic format makes corpus investigation possible.
The first chapter of Part Two (Chapter 4) focuses on the two versions of Soseki’s travel essay, *London shōsoku*, written in 1901 while he was in London and modified in 1915 for a reprint. These two mark the beginning and the end of his career and indicate the changes that took place in his writing during the intervening 15 years. The aim is to find out what kind of changes Soseki made in the later version and whether they are the result simply of personal preference or of wider linguistic change that happened over the period. Further discussions of these changes occur in later chapters.

Chapter 5 investigates Soseki’s thirteen novels written between 1905 and 1916. It attempts to draw patterns in his pronoun use (all three persons) from the data acquired through quantitative and diachronic investigations based on electronic corpora.

Chapter 6 investigates the distribution of the two types of 3PPs, the *kare* type and the *ko-so-a* type, and their variants in dialogue and narrative in Soseki’s novels. The evidence shows that in his writing, out of the *ko-so-a* pronouns, the majority of *ko-* and *so-*pronouns appear in the narrative part of his novels, while the majority of *a-*pronouns appear in the dialogue, complementing the use of the *kare* type pronouns that appear predominantly in narrative.

Chapter 7 investigates the referents of *kare* through the Edo to Meiji periods. It shows the specializing process of *kare* from all-purpose (human/non-human, male/female and singular/plural) reference to male singular as well as the expanding process of the referent range, types and collocations within the specialized referent area. These changes are presented with empirical data and analyzed within a theoretical framework of grammaticalization.

Chapter 8 focuses only on the female 3PP (*kanojo*) and investigates its formation, using a number of novels written in the Edo to Taishō periods. It consists of two main parts: the first is a historical investigation of *kanojo (she)* as it appeared in novels between the late Edo and mid Meiji periods: the second deals with a corpus analyses of *kanojo* in Soseki’s novels. Together, these demonstrate the layering (co-existence of multiple forms and sounds to one function) and grammaticalizing
process of kanoonna (she) to kanojo (she).

Chapter 9 extends its investigation to Soseki’s contemporaries and the generations of writers who came before and after him. The comparison between these writers and Soseki not only illustrates individual tendencies but also draws attention to the pattern of the wider change that was affecting all of them. Thus, it captures the complexity of the 3PP change and presents a clearer picture of the process, not only with statistically valid data but also with insights into literary and social aspects of the language.

Finally, conclusions are drawn from the independent but related investigations of the preceding chapters which shed light on the intricate process of pronoun change and the ‘formal versus colloquial’, ‘narrative versus dialogue’ and ‘Chinese versus English’ issues of the kare type 3PPs. As the study discovers, pronoun change is not a simple cause and effect process but a complex web of intertwined and interacting factors of both linguistic and extra-linguistic origin, that collectively sometimes accelerate and at other times slow change. In the practice of contemporary translation and literary writing, the 3PPs can be problematic and confusing. In addition, opinions of how to deal with them are divided. Most scholars who try to explain kare, kanojo, and karera as modern neologisms are often ignorant of their long history and connection with Chinese, and those who approach them from an honorific point of view are missing the point: relative lack of honorific values contributed to their adoption in the first place and to their later increase in frequency. And because of their high frequency in modern writing, the Traditionalist approach to eliminate the 3PPs is so far removed in time from Traditional practice when the 3PPs were scarce that it is hardly practical. This thesis contributes substantially to our understanding of the pattern of 3PP change and the main influencing factors; and explores its link to other changes simultaneously occurring, from a more functional viewpoint. It also presents a new investigative framework for diachronic research with empirical and statistically valid data.

Focusing on the 3PPs, Part One is primarily an original synthesis which links the work of various prominent theorists and commentators into a coherent framework of related but not previously integrated approaches to historical research. Part Two is an
original and critical analysis of the development of the 3PPs in Soseki's novels that
gains its insights from application of the 'framework' developed in Part One. Thus,
the work is submitted as a significant step in the process of clarification of pronoun
change and is intended to contribute to both the general issue of language change,
and specific use of 3PPs in the novels of Soseki and several other turn-of-the-20th-
century writers.

Note: Appendix A shows some further changes following the time of Soseki's death, which
is outside the timeframe of the thesis. Nevertheless, it forms an extension of the "applied"
part of this study. Appendix A deals a historical investigation of the female plural 3PPs,
*kanojora* and *kanojotachi*, which were absent in Soseki's writing but emerged between the
two World Wars and established themselves in the 1940s. This study complements the
historical approach adopted for investigations of the 3PPs in Soseki's novels in the main
text.
Chapter 1
Historical background and definition

1.1 Introduction

This chapter has three purposes. First it explains the importance of the Meiji period (1868-1912) (the time), Natsume Soseki (the writer) and personal pronouns (the subject) for the linguistic investigation. Second, it highlights the differences and similarities between English personal pronouns and Japanese counterparts. Third, it gives the definition of modern-day Japanese personal pronouns deduced from the comparison with English counterparts, and examines several definitions suggested by Japanese scholars.

1.2 Historical background
1.2.1 Genbunitchi

The Meiji period in Japan was an era of enormous change. After more than two hundred years of isolation, the nation opened up and faced the daunting task of ‘catching up’ with the civilized Western countries. Changes occurred in many aspects of life during this period and were more abrupt and manifold than any change the Japanese had previously experienced; they affected the whole nation.

The Japanese language was no exception and went through a substantial transformation. Once, there was one way to write and another way to speak in Japanese. Chinese style (kanbuntai) writing was highly regarded as ‘proper writing’ among educated males. At the same time there was a large population of Japanese who were only able to read kana syllabaries and a small number of kanji (Chinese characters), and enjoyed illustrated novels written mostly in kana. These people, educated or uneducated, spoke a variety of regional dialects, which were mutually almost unintelligible, thus creating a diglossic
society with kanbuntai as the high (H) variety used exclusively for writing and many colloquial dialects as low (L) varieties.¹ Kanbuntai was not accessible to everyone since it required a long period of education to learn the thousands of kanji associated with it and the idiosyncratic way of reading them: further, it was a writing system and not needed in everyday interaction. The contact with the Western civilization and the modern Japanese language reform called genbunitchi changed all that.

Genbunitchi is commonly understood as ‘the unification of spoken and written languages’. This is because it was often paired with government promotion of the Tokyo dialect as a nationally accepted standard spoken language. For the government, it was a unification of the language in that it could be spoken and read by the majority of the people, and consequently unify the nation. But for literary writers, as indicated by Ogai (1890) in Genbunron (A Theory on Speech and Writing), it was the creation of a new writing style that could express one’s thought and feelings more freely without the constraints of the H variety. It was a natural outcome that genbunitchi was first experimented with in school textbooks (by the government) and novels (by writers) (Kubota 1996: 337). It was a rare occasion when writers and the government, while differing in motives, worked independently for the same goal and achieved it.

Novelists were the forerunners of writing reform in the Meiji period. The first major colloquial novel, Ukigumo (The Drifting Clouds), written by Futabatei Shimei was published in 1887. Its impact was extremely strong and prompted many writers to experiment in various new colloquial styles until finally settling on a single one. By 1908 all novels in the major literary journals were published in genbunitchi, but it was not until the 1920s that the major newspapers were employing the genbunitchi style for all sections of the newspaper (Yamamoto 1977: 342). On the other hand, some official documents continued to be written in a formal kanbuntai until the end of the Second World War. In short, the linguistic changes occurring in writing during this period are

¹ The diglossic situation in pre-Meiji Japan was more complex than the simple picture portrayed here, with various sub-categories of writing such as wabuntai (traditional Japanese style), wakan konkōtai (Japanese and Chinese mixed style), kanbun kundokutai (kanbun style writing, which follows Japanese word order, and with grammatical terms inserted between Chinese characters in kana), etc. These details are excluded here in order to avoid confusion, since kanbun is the key factor in this period of change.
observable first in novels. This makes novels of this era suitable materials for investigation of language change.

1.2.2 Soseki’s background

A Meiji novelist, Natsume Soseki, has been chosen for the main focus of the thesis. The reason for the selection will be explained later in this section (also, see Introduction), but first his background is summarised below.

Natsume Soseki was born in 1867, a year before the Meiji restoration, in Edo (Tokyo). He was the fifth son of a wealthy nanushi (a town representative). He enjoyed Chinese classics from an early age and at 14 studied kanbun at Nishōgakusha high school (a school specializing in Chinese studies) for two years. Originally thinking of becoming an architect, Soseki changed his mind following a friend’s advice and decided to study English. In 1890 he was accepted into the English department at Tokyo University. He was the only student to take English in his year, indicating the unpopularity of the course; English study was in decline following the anti-Western movement of the 1880s. After graduating from university, Soseki took up teaching positions at high schools in Matsuyama (1895) and Kumamoto (1896). In 1900, he was given a government fellowship to go to England. Initially the aim of the fellowship was to study English teaching methods. However, Soseki persuaded the government to let him study English literature rather than the language itself. On September 8th, 1900, he boarded a ship in Yokohama for England.

On his return to Japan in 1903, Soseki took up the lecturing post vacated by Lafcadio Hearn at Tokyo University. He taught Theories on Literature\(^2\), which was conceived during his stay in London. Four years later, he left the university to accept a full time writing contract with the Asahi Shinbun (a major newspaper). Prior to that (1905), Soseki had written his first novel, Wagahai wa neko dearu (I Am a Cat) in colloquial style for his friend’s haiku journal, Hototogisu (Bush Warbler). This was an instant

\(^2\) A series of lectures given at Tokyo University, which was published in 1907 after Soseki left the University.
success and gave him the opportunity to become a full time writer. From 1907, all his novels were published in the Asahi newspaper as daily instalments until his death in 1916. All of these deal with modern Japanese lives and are written in a colloquial style. In spite of the popularity of his novels, Soseki’s move from the university to a newspaper was a surprise to many. Nevertheless, Soseki was the first modern Japanese writer who was able to live comfortably, solely on his income from writing.

Soseki belonged to the last generation who were able to read and write effortlessly in kanbun, and from whom this formed their literary foundation. His education in a Western language at Tokyo University was laid on top of this foundation and prepared him for his subsequent travels to Europe. This particular linguistic background is an important factor in his colloquial writing and use of 3PPs, which will be closely examined in Part Two.

Although Soseki’s writing career was relatively short, it was extremely productive. His writing stretches over a diverse range of genres including novels, short stories, essays, literary criticism, poetry (Chinese and English poems, and haiku), travelogue, diaries and letters. But it is his novels that show remarkable consistency in production rate and theme. To meet the requirement of writing a novel or two novellas a year stated in his contract with the Asahi Newspaper, he wrote approximately a full-length novel a year for eleven years until his death in 1916 with only one disruption in 1910 due to illness. In addition, he was a writer who pursued the same theme, ‘the bewildering array of social relationships’ (Uchida 1983: 350), throughout his career. Quite often his novels have brooding protagonists surrounded by familiar characters in a middle class setting. Soseki was not a radical innovator in the sense that he did not actively engage in the promotion of a new style of writing or literary movement, such as Naturalism or Romanticism. Nevertheless, he was a progressive, learned leader and an influential writer of his time. His periodical writing, recurrent theme and the similar number of characters (people) in each novel make his texts very suitable for the investigation of diachronic change in pronoun use.
Out of Soseki's 23 novels, 13 are selected for corpus investigation based on the following points:

a) their availability in electronic forms,
b) the large volume of writing in the form of longer novels, and
c) the serialization of novels in daily newspapers and periodical journals.

Points a) and b) are crucial for corpus-based investigation and c) reflects the popularity and accessibility of these works to the reading public. Soseki's serialized and consistent writing for a daily newspaper for eleven years and his keen eye for language as an academic and great practitioner of writing offer a good model for a diachronic investigation in one genre: the novel written in the _genbunitchi_ style. Also the large circulation of the _Asahi_ newspaper for which Soseki was writing and the popularity of his novels reflect the magnitude of influence he had (see also 9.6).

1.2.3 Development of Japanese pronoun system

First, we will look briefly at the historical development of Japanese personal pronouns in order to capture a wider picture of these, and to place the linguistic situation of the Meiji period in a historical context.

Tsujimura (1971) illustrates historical change in Japanese personal pronouns from the eighth century to the present. Table 1-1 is based on his book and lists major personal pronouns used in each historical period, although it is by no means exhaustive. The variety of pronouns increased through time and the nature of pronouns changed from _absolute_ to _relative_³ in the early Edo period (Toyama 1977: 146). The 3PP is conspicuous by its near absence. The Edo period demonstrates the most complex, hierarchical and inter-relational variations; samurai and other classes each used different types of personal pronouns, reflecting the rigidly controlled hierarchy system. It also

---

³ Absolute honorifics: if the referent is a senior or superior person, the speaker invariably uses honorific expressions for the person. Relative honorifics: even when the referent is senior or superior, the speaker may not use honorific terms to refer to this person depending on whether the speaker feels relatively closer (psychologically) to the referent or the addressee.
shows the regional difference between the Kanto (Edo) and Kansai (Kyoto/Osaka) areas. These changes occurred during Japan’s isolation from the outside world. Although, there had been a long history of cultural contact with China, the actual contacts were very much localized and restricted to a small number of elite scholars, Buddhist monks and diplomats. Therefore it is reasonable to say that the changes were motivated by internal factors.

The key difference in the Meiji period is that the change was not only internally motivated but also driven by strong and sudden external forces, namely the first large scale direct contact with the West. This contact brought a few changes in pronouns such as increased use of first and second person plural forms (e.g. wareware and shokun) through the acquired practice of political debate (Kato 1989), and that of the 3PPs, kare (he) and kanojo (she), supposedly through translation (Yanabu 1996 and Yanase 2000). However, the variety of first and second person forms in general, which had consistently increased through time, actually decreased in this period. Many scholars (e.g. Karatani, 1996, Noguchi 1994, Yamamoto 1977 and Morioka 1969) suggest that the more even and homogeneous society created by the abolition of the class system and the reduction in regional differences due to the promotion of Tokyo dialect as a standard language were two of the main contributing factors to the decrease.

Many changes, linguistic or extra-linguistic, which occurred during the Meiji period are often discussed in relation to Western influence. Many scholarly inquiries, focusing on this period alone, have been based on this framework. The debates on the increased use of 3PPs as the results of interference through translation, as mentioned above, are such examples. However, a change is a temporal phenomenon. In order to understand the mechanism of change, it is necessarily to know the situation before a visible change took place. For example, Table 1-1 gives an impression that the 3PPs, kare, kano and are, suddenly appeared in the Edo period and konohito, sonohito, anohito and others in the Meiji period without precedents. But was this really the case? What’s more, did all these 3PPs follow the same pattern of change? These questions will form a core part of
investigative chapters in Part Two. But before tackling these questions, we have to know the characteristics of Japanese Personal pronouns. This is the focus of the next section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>1PP</th>
<th>2PP</th>
<th>3PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jōdai</td>
<td>wake, yakko</td>
<td>kimi, ōkimif→m ōnamuchi, namuchi, namutachi, wake, yakko, ore, onore, nabito, shiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(794-1192)</td>
<td>ore, onore, nabito, shiko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodai</td>
<td>ware, koko, nanigashi, onore,</td>
<td>kimi, to, ōmae, kimuzi, namuzi, namudachi namuzira, na, nare, soko, mauto, onore, ware (late Kodai)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(794-1192)</td>
<td>ono, onora, maro</td>
<td></td>
<td>kuyatsu, suyatsu, kayatsu (all very rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūsei</td>
<td>yatsugare, ware, kokomoto, mizukara, warera, wareware, shōsei, boku, yo, ore, konata, soregashi, chin, Female: wagami, warawa ora, kochi, , temae, washi, watakushi,</td>
<td>kimi, ō(n)koto, onore, omae, soko, nanzi, nusi, ware, kika, kiden, sonka, onono, onmi, sochi, sore, wagami, wagoze, kihō, are, onushì, onoshi, katagata, konata, onata, konasama, sonokata, somoji, kikō, wagoryō, kisho, sokka, sonkun, sonkō</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1192-1603)</td>
<td>Samurai: konokata midomo, sessha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edo</td>
<td>oira, kochitora, kochito, kochira, kotchi, watai,</td>
<td>agami, anata, arisama, aresama, anta, unu, onosama, omi, konasan, konan, temē, konta, sama, sosama, sochitora, sonomoto, wamoji, kikun, kikei, kisama,</td>
<td>kare kano are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1603-1867)</td>
<td>watashi, wachiki, ore, wareware(7g.), soregashi, mizukara, watc, watakushi, warawa, warera.</td>
<td>Samurai: sessha, mi, midomo, soregashi, ware, wareware</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kansai area: ware, warera, ore, watakushi, ware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Late Edo: wachiki, watai, ora</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiji</td>
<td>watakushi, watakushitachi, watakushidomo, watashi, watashitachi,</td>
<td>anata, anatach, anagata, anatasama, omae, omaetachi, omaegata, omaesama, omaesann, kimi, kimitchi, kimagata, kimira, nanji (writing)</td>
<td>are, konohito sonohito anohito koitsu soitsu aitsu kare, karera, kanojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1868-1912)</td>
<td>Female: atakushi, atashi, atashitachi ore, oira, shōsei, jibun, wareware</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Characteristics of Japanese personal pronouns

In this section, several issues and characteristics concerning Japanese personal pronouns are discussed with reference to English counterparts: these include the origin of the term (section 1.3.1), the nature of pronouns (1.3.2), the concept of reference (1.3.3) and zero pronoun as a norm (1.3.4).

1.3.1 Origin of the term

‘Personal pronoun’ as a linguistic term first appeared in Japan at the end of the 18th century. A Dutch translator, Utagawa Genzui, used *hito o shōsuru shi* (terms referring to people) in his 1793 publication of *Rangaku benbō* (A Guide for Dutch Translation) (Sugimoto 1983: 234). Later at the beginning of the 19th century, Nakano Ryūho, another Dutch translator, used the term *daimeishi* (pronoun) in his Dutch grammar in which he categorised Dutch into nine parts of speech. It was also the first book written by a Japanese that analysed the syntactic elements of Dutch. Both translators were based in Nagasaki. Ryūho’s book was widely read by students and scholars of Dutch Studies (*rangaku*) during the Edo period (Sugimoto 1990: 159). At about the same time, Motoori Norinaga, a prominent scholar of Japanese based in Edo (now Tokyo), invented a set of grammatical terms for the Japanese language. However, Norinaga’s new terms had fallen out of use by the end of the Edo period. Ryūho’s terms, on the other hand, were adopted for English and French Studies, which replaced Dutch studies during the late Edo period, and by the early Meiji period were in use for Japanese linguistic studies as well. They continue to be used to this day. By contrast, Norinaga’s terms are completely forgotten.

This preference for terminology based on ‘the foreign’ rather than ‘the local’ is indicative of problems we are facing now, although their origin is often ignored or forgotten. The terms originally created for Dutch and adopted for Japanese, regardless of the linguistic distance between the two languages have created confusion, discrepancies and ambiguities. As English grammarians initially based their analysis of English on Latin, the beginning of modern Japanese linguistic investigation was based on the terms
and definitions transferred from Western languages. This has created a situation where the same term, for instance ‘pronoun’, is used for two (or more) very different categories of linguistic items that function differently in Japanese; the sheer variety of personal pronouns in Table 1.1 would suggest its difference from the English (and other European) counterparts. In other words, when we say ‘English pronouns’, ‘Japanese pronouns’ or ‘French pronouns’, we automatically think that these ‘pronouns’ refer to a group of terms that function in more or less in the same way in each language, and rarely question the possibility of misnomers.

In order to avoid misconception and to properly analyse the historical changes that occurred during the late nineteenth century and early twentieth century under the influence of the Western languages (mainly English), it is necessary to define what ‘personal pronoun’ means in English and, quite separately, what it means in Japanese. The following sections will examine a number of distinctive features of Japanese personal pronouns.

1.3.2 Noun or pronoun

According to Hirsch, Jr., Kett, and Trefil (2002), some languages do not have the grammatical category of pronoun. Both Japanese and Korean are listed as such languages. They explain that in these languages, “a small set of nouns that reference the discourse participants” exist (although they do not explain how small “a small set” actually is). However, in practice, proper personal names, some deictics and titles are often used instead of these referential nouns. They also add that some languages do not have 3PPs and in those cases, demonstratives and full noun phrases are employed to refer to third persons. This explanation may be appropriate for the pre-modern linguistic situation of Japan, with its extensive hierarchical and deictic pronoun system, but the modern situation is more complicated.

---

4 Ōtsuki Fumihiko (1897) combined traditional Japanese studies and Western grammar in his book Kōnshon bunten and Yamada Yoshio used Fujitani Nariakira's Japanese studies, Sweet's English grammar and Heise's German grammar to write Nihon bunpō ron (1908) and Nihon bunpōgaku gairon (1936).

5 Hirsch and Trefil give an example of Latin that “made do without third-person pronouns, replacing them by demonstratives (which are in fact the source of personal pronouns in all Romance languages)”.
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Modern Japanese scholars have been divided on this issue since the introduction of the term. Some consider pronouns as a subcategory of nouns (Ôtsuki 1897, Matsushita 1901 & 1930, Yamada 1936, Hashimoto 1948), while others identify them with demonstratives (e.g. Sakuma 1931, Mikami 1972). Some even question the category of 'personal pronoun' in Japanese (e.g. Matsuyama 1992, Yanase 1996). The latter argue that Japanese personal pronouns differ from English personal pronouns in meaning, function and form, and therefore they may belong to a different grammatical category. English personal pronouns have much less precise semantic content and more general uses. By comparison, Japanese personal pronouns are so heavily loaded with semantic, honorific, social and psychological connotations that they can hardly convey general reference, and instead have highly specific reference (Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 33).

In terms of function, the role of substituting for nouns and noun phrases (NPs) in order to avoid repetition, which is considered to be the most common one for English personal pronouns (Wales 1996: 1), does not fit comfortably in Japanese. In Japanese discourse and texts, there are many examples in which nouns and NPs are repeatedly used, instead of substituted by pronouns. The absence of case distinctions also sets Japanese personal pronouns aside from English ones. The function of case is given to particles in Japanese. Kuroda argues (1965: 105) Japanese does not have overt forms that correspond directly to English personal pronouns, in a way that is meaningful to grammatical studies, and this creates a major problem in the field of machine translation.

The latest trend is to view Japanese personal pronouns as more noun-like items. Noguchi (1997: 1) describes Japanese pronouns as N[oun]-pronouns, meaning that they function like nouns. And Kanaya (2002: 34) also agrees that Japanese pronouns behave syntactically more like nouns rather than determiners. In particular, the 3PPs, kare and kanojo, sometimes function as common nouns in contemporary Japanese. Höji (2002: 54) goes further and states that if we are looking for English-type pronouns in Japanese, we do not expect to find pronouns but only nouns. This is a criticism against those who

---

6 The two functions of kare and kanojo, pronominal and nominal, have to be dealt with separately. The nominalization did not occur until after the grammaticalization of these terms and after Soseki's death. Therefore, it is excluded from this study.
treat pronouns as something universal and do not question their culturally specific nature. Some of the characteristics of the Japanese personal pronouns that prompt such comments will be explained in the following sections.

1.3.3 Concept of reference
The English personal pronouns, I and you, refer to someone in terms of their utterance role (Gasser 2003). The word, you, is part of the form of the utterance and is joined by the meaning arrow to the role of hearer, whoever it is, rather than a particular individual. I refers to whoever the speaker is. You and I are examples that refer directly to participants in the utterance context. Any reference which is not the first person or second person belongs to the third person.

This notion of referring any individual or group of people, regardless of their social standing, gender or age, with the same personal pronouns is something alien to the Japanese language. In a discourse situation, a Japanese speaker would find it extremely difficult to address the person whom s/he is about to talk to without knowing where s/he stands in relation to the addressee. The usual scenario is that the speaker does not use any personal pronouns until s/he makes a proper assessment of the relationship. Then s/he may choose a pair of the first and second personal pronouns that s/he thinks would fit into the particular situation. If the same speaker and addressee move to a different social environment, they in turn may choose a different set of personal pronouns. In this sense, Japanese personal pronouns are highly situational or contextual. As Mühlhäusler and Harré (1990: 133) aptly summarise, “characteristic features of Japanese social system are very fully represented in the grammar of Japanese forms of address. Almost every social distinction possible between speakers, the recognition and display of which is necessary to the smooth development of an encounter, is overtly expressed in language choice, while almost every grammatical nuance carries a social meaning”.

This conceptual gap between Japanese pronouns and Western counterparts is well expressed by translators of the Edo period. The aforementioned Utagawa Genzui, in his

---

7 Even after going through this process, it is quite likely that one chooses not to use any pronoun at all.
Dutch grammar *Rangaku Benbō* (1793), notes the impossible task he faced in describing the concept of Dutch personal pronouns in Japanese. He questions the validity of classifying personal pronouns as the first, second and third persons. He also finds it extremely difficult to understand the concept of ‘self’ as an independent being in opposition to nature. To him (and to his contemporary Japanese), nature came first and human beings were only a part of it. Therefore the concept of the speaker as the first and foremost was hard to grasp. Even harder to understand was the binary concept represented by the first and the second as oppositions. For the second and third person pronouns, Genzui (1793) wrote, “there is no term for them in Japanese” (quoted in Sugimoto 1983: 238). Genzui’s dilemma is still shared by many Japanese who have been in contact with European languages. For instance: Hashimoto (1982: 222) also questions the three categories of persons; Mori (1970) describes the relationship between the speaker and the addressee in Japanese as something more intimate unlike the binary oppositions of the ‘I–you’ relationship in English; and Komori (1988a: 4) suggests that Japanese discursive space is build upon harmonious co-existence of the speaker and listener.

1.3.4 Zero pronoun

The difference between personal pronouns in English and Japanese is directly related to the structural difference of the two languages. This structural difference becomes most obvious and problematic with machine translation, because computers cannot deal with ambiguities and require the differences to be met. For this purpose, Huang (1984) categorises languages in two types. One is a discourse-oriented language that requires the listener's active participation in identifying empty categories\(^8\). Japanese, Chinese and Korean belong to this type. Another is a sentence-oriented language that provides enough syntactic clues for the identification of empty categories. English is an example of this type. He adds that one of the major differences between these two language types is that “discourse-oriented languages can have a zero topic operator”, which has to be retrieved in a way computers can process.

---

\(^8\) Empty categories: any unit in a sentence that is not overtly expressed, also known as elliptical construction. E.g. *Fire when ready*. Empty categories of this sentence are *you are*.  
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This aspect has been an important issue in the areas of systemic grammar as well as machine translation. Iida (1996) proposed a dual approach that applies both syntax and pragmatics to determine antecedence. Yoshimoto (1988: 779) suggests, “zero-pronouns can be identified by means of cognitive and sociolinguistic information in honorific, deictic, speech-act, and mental predicates”. Yet, these frameworks for solving the problem are far from perfect, considering the difference between English and Japanese personal pronouns. For example, according to Yamamoto's investigation of a sample of Japanese dialogues (94 sentences, 2 dialogue sequences) and their English translation, the occurrences of personal pronouns are 2 in Japanese and 53 in English. This small sample strongly suggests that there are too many missing personal pronouns for a computer to pick up.

There have been various explanations for the common occurrence of zero pronouns in Japanese. For example, Matsuyama (1992) refers to the SOV structure of Japanese sentences as a possible cause of zero pronouns. Yoshimoto (1988: 782) notes that Japanese predicates do not indicate morphologically grammatical information such as person, gender, case and number, and need contextual factors to retrieve information referred to by zero anaphora. Hori (1995) argues that the honorific auxiliary verbs suffixed to verbs contribute to the elimination of subjects (and presumably, objects and topics). She emphasises that the existence of the subject in a sentence is not universal. This argument is further extended by Kanaya (2002: 50-51) who is strongly opposed to the notion of the subject in Japanese. He argues that the term 'ellipsis' is inappropriate for Japanese, because structurally, the Japanese language does not presuppose the existence of a subject at all.

While acknowledging zero pronouns as a norm and unmarked element in Japanese, the question persists: do we view the frequent appearances of personal pronouns (for subjects, objects or topics) in modern writing, although still far less frequent compared to those in English, as a decrease of ellipsis or an increase of redundant uses? It is a complex and disputed matter. Further, an adequate examination of this issue would be a thesis in itself and may not result in a fruitful conclusion relevant to the current topic any
way. However, the question (ellipsis or redundancy) recurs when Japanese is compared with other languages, in areas such as language teaching and translation. Since this thesis deals with translation, this issue cannot be overlooked and is further examined in Chapters 5 (sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.3) and 7 (section 7.5) in relation to frequency increase.

In summary, Japanese personal pronouns demonstrate differences in various aspects from their English counterparts. They have a much larger vocabulary, function more like nouns, have strong honorific connotations, are less frequently used (zero pronoun is a norm) and their referring function as neutral substitutions for nouns is overshadowed by social and honorific constraints. This suggests the need for a different definition and investigative approach to Japanese personal pronouns.

1.4 Paradigms of Japanese personal pronouns

With the differences that surfaced in the previous section in mind, this section will summarise major characteristics of personal pronouns in English and Japanese, present the paradigm of modern-day Japanese personal pronouns with a focus on the 3PPs, and finally, give definition to Japanese 3PPs, which will become the basis of this study.

Table 1-2 summarises the characteristics of Japanese personal pronouns explained in the previous sections in comparison to their English equivalents. However, these should be viewed as commonly acknowledged tendencies rather than rules and there are exceptions.

English personal pronouns are commonly defined as “a closed set of lexical items that, (...) can substitute for a noun or a noun phrase” (Mühlhäuser and Harré 1990: 9). This definition is based on the two characteristics highlighted in bold in Table 1-2: a closed class and the function of substitution. Wales (1996: 1-4) argues against this notion and suggests that the function of substitution may be the main function of the 3PP but a
minor one of the 1PP and 2PP. Because their substitution or referring field is more restricted: ‘I’ for the speaker and ‘you’ for the addressee. Further, she adds that English definitions of personal pronouns are often based only on the 3PP, and 1PP and 2PP are left out: this is partly due to a long history of English grammar and its reliance on written texts rather than discourse situations. It is also because “the 3PP is often seen as the ‘prototypical’ personal pronoun in contrast to the first and second” (Wales 1996: 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Personal pronouns</th>
<th>Japanese Personal Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1: Belong to a small word class.</td>
<td>Include a broad range of vocabulary items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2: Stand in place of nouns and noun phrases.</td>
<td>Point directly to people and things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3: Are used on their own (independent).</td>
<td>Can be modified by adjectives and pronouns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4: Normally have anaphoric reference(^9).</td>
<td>Deictic/endophoric/exophoric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5: Have case distinctions</td>
<td>Cases are indicated by postpositions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6: Abstract, generic and formal representation.</td>
<td>Encode social and hierarchical distinctions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8: Cannot normally be left out.</td>
<td>Zero pronouns are common.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9: Have not changed much over time.</td>
<td>Constant changes throughout history.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, Tsukishima (1980: 111) chose the following as the most significant characteristics of Japanese personal pronouns (also highlighted in bold in Table 1-2). They have:

a) a large vocabulary,
b) usage restrictions according to age, gender, status, intimacy, etc., and
c) frequent changes through time.

The sheer number of personal pronouns in Japanese makes it hard to categorise them as a closed class similar to the class of English pronouns. Neither usage restrictions nor constant changes through time are prominent in the English counterparts. These are

\(^9\) Although some scholars including Mühlhäusler and Harré argue against this narrow view of function of personal pronouns as mainly anaphoric (e.g. Wales 1996, Lyons 1979), it still is the convention accepted by many linguists.
closely related to their strong honorific functions. However, these characteristics are not necessarily attributed to the 3PP. The list of Japanese personal pronouns in Table 1-1 shows very few varieties of 3PPs compared with overwhelmingly numerous 1PPs and 2PPs. It also indicates that the common use of 3PPs is a relatively new phenomenon (from the 17th century onward) and 3PPs have not gone through as many changes as 1PPs and 2PPs have. From this evidence, it is obvious that Tsukushima’s definition of Japanese personal pronouns is based on the 1PP and 2PP. The 3PP in Japanese, especially the kare type, display none of the above characteristics and, therefore, asks for new definitions or even separate treatment.

Wales’s comment on English personal pronouns and Tsukushima’s definition of Japanese personal pronouns highlight different approaches to personal pronouns. They demonstrate that the main function of English personal pronouns has been considered to be that of substitution on the basis of the 3PP that is frequent in written texts, and the other important functions of the 1PP and 2PP that are frequent in speech are often overlooked. In Japanese, the situation is reversed. Personal pronouns are defined on the basis of the 1PP and 2PP, and the 3PP does not fit into the definition. These comments indicate a large gap between the 1PP/2PP and 3PP in both English and Japanese, which has not been properly acknowledged or specified, with the same definition being used for all three regardless of the differences. Much confusion and many conflicting arguments arise from this fundamental mistake.

Bearing this in mind, Table 1-3 is an attempt to classify and present visually the modern-day Japanese personal pronouns and demonstrative pronouns. The Table shows only singular forms of commonly used personal pronouns in order to avoid unnecessary confusion. Also demonstrative pronouns are included in the Table to highlight the deictic nature of Japanese 3PPs. As the table clearly demonstrates, the 3PP has a distinctively different system from the 1PP and 2PP. Together with the demonstrative pronouns, it forms a more deictic system (pointing function) categorised by the physical and psychological proximity to the speaker/writer and each indicated by a common first syllable, ko for ‘near distance’, so for ‘middle distance’ and a for ‘far distance’. In fact,
together with the interrogative, do, they form a very neat system called the ko-so-a-do paradigm (see Sakuma 1936 and Mikami 1955, for detailed explanations of this system).

### Table 1-3: Modern-day Japanese personal pronouns (singular only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First person (jishō)</th>
<th>Personal Pronouns</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The speaker</td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boku, ore</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person (taishō)</td>
<td>The addressee</td>
<td>anata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>omae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Third person (tashō)</th>
<th>3rd Person Pronouns</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>near (kinshō)</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>konokata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>middle (chūshō)</td>
<td>so</td>
<td>konohito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>far (enshō)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>sonokata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(far)</em></td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>sonohito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>asoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>achira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(kare)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(kanato)*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interrogative (futeishō)</th>
<th>Personal Pronouns</th>
<th>Demonstrative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>do</td>
<td>Unknown to the speaker</td>
<td>donokata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>donohito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>doko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dochira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dotchi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Archaic uses listed to show the origin of kare and kanojo.

In conclusion, it must be said that the Japanese personal pronouns are different from the English counterparts that Wales (1996: 4) describes as “useful ‘shorthand’ referring expressions”. They have a large vocabulary, strong honorific connotations and are less frequently used. From all these points, the characteristics of the present-day Japanese personal pronouns can be summarised:

Japanese personal pronouns refer to humans by pointing at the person(s) (deictic function) without mentioning the names of the referents. They have a large vocabulary and the choice of a particular pronoun in a speech situation is determined by the relationship between the speaker and the addressee. They are categorised in four groups according to the referent; jishō (the speaker), taishō (the addressee), tashō (others) and futeishō (the unknown). These groups roughly correspond to English first person, second person, third person and interrogative person, respectively. Further, tashō are categorised in three sub-groups according
to the physical and psychological distance from the speaker; kinshō (close to the speaker), chūshō (middle distance from the speaker/close to the addressee) and enshō (far from both the speaker and the addressee). Each sub-group begins with a syllable, ko, so and a, respectively, and together with the interrogative which begins with do, form the ko-so-a-do paradigm, which is derived from demonstratives.

This summary appears to cover major features of Japanese personal pronouns. However, the other type of 3PP, kare and kanojo, shows a slightly different pattern. Although they originate from the demonstrative, ka, which indicates ‘far distance’ from the speaker similar to a, the demonstrative function has fallen out of use sometime ago and the physical distance that ka used to convey has been largely lost. This makes them relatively free from the honorific constraint. Thus, kare and kanojo have acquired a set of functions distinct from the ko-so-a set. Noguchi (1994: 126) supports this and suggests that as the 3PP should be treated separately from the 1PP and 2PP, so should the kare 3PP from the ko-so-a set.

From these characteristics, the Japanese 3PPs can be described:

the Japanese third person pronoun has two distinctive types, the ko-so-a type and kare type, each of which function differently. The former has a strong spatial element and is grouped according to the proximity to the speaker. The latter also has its origin in a spatial context (a demonstrative, ka, now disused), but has lost its spatial connotation and is used with greater neutrality and is relatively free from honorific constraint.

Investigations throughout the thesis will be based on the above definition. The existence of the two sets of 3PPs, their frequencies and functions, and how they relate to the development of modern colloquial novel writing will be closely examined in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.
Chapter 2

Theoretical background and methodology

A fuller understanding of all the issues suggests that it is necessary to coordinate historical work with sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and corpus studies; such coordination should lead to a better understanding of the extent to which the locus of change is to be found in changes in grammars of speech community, to what extent in the mind/brain of speakers, and how changes in language use may lead to changes in the language system.

(Hopper & Traugott, 2003: 233)

2.1 Introduction

Although this research is primarily a historical investigation, it integrates a number of theories and methods from other disciplines to identify the process of pronoun change and the mechanism behind it. As Hopper and Traugott (2003: 233) suggest, the integrated approach not only leads us to a better understanding of language change but, more fundamentally, is necessary for this type of study for the following reasons.

First, unlike the views of traditionalist grammarians who consider language as a static and neatly structured entity, this research views language as something more dynamic and complex, that is constantly changing through interactions with social, psychological, historical and other extra-linguistic factors.

Second, its focus is ‘change’ that inevitably seeks multifaceted approaches for us to obtain a fair and fuller picture of it, because as Nevalainen (2004: 16) and Berges (2005) confirm, “change is both generational (linked to language acquisition) and communal (linked to networks of speakers)” (Berges quoted in Brinton and Traugott 2005: 9).

Third, the particular historical period chosen for the investigation (the turn of the 20th century) is one of the most turbulent periods in Japanese history, involving the first
large-scale contact with the West. Thus the methods of language contact and translation studies are required.

And finally, in order to obtain statistically valid data, it requires a large volume of texts for investigation. For this, methods of corpus linguistics, especially access to electronic corpora and concordance software, are indispensable.

Section 2.2 explains the key theories that form the backbone of this research and section 2.3 outlines the purpose and methods of corpus-based diachronic investigation employed in this thesis.

2.2 Theories

2.2.1 Historical linguistics
The principles of two streams of historical linguistics are employed in this study. One is grammaticalization and the other is language contact, which are further combined in a new approach, ‘contact-induced grammaticalization’ (e.g. Heine and Kuteva 2003), and adopted for the investigation of Japanese pronoun change through contact with European and Chinese languages around the turn of the 20th century.

(1) Grammaticalization: definitions
Grammaticalization is a term introduced by Meillet (1912), in relation to the neogrammarian/Saussurean view of language in which change is viewed as abrupt, complete, and all change grown from within grammar is considered ‘analogical’ (created through generalization) (Kiparsky 2004). Meillet proposed a second type of change, grammaticalization, as change that gives rise to new grammatical categories. This process (grammaticalization) is said to be the origin of virtually all grammatical forms (Delancey 1997), at least in English. Meillet’s view is based on his understanding of language as dynamic and constantly renewing, where “change depends upon variation,
proceeds gradually, and is shaped by linguistic and social factors” (Brinton and Traugott 2005: 9). His is a functionalist approach and since then studies of grammaticalization have been carried out largely by functionalist scholars (Brinton and Traugott 2005: 9).

However, grammaticalization has seen a number of new definitions and modifications since its original conception. These changes in definitions reflect changing attitudes towards and advances in understanding of language change. Traugott, who is an authority in this field, has modified her definition of grammaticalization in each of her last three major publications: *Grammaticalization* (Hopper and Traugott 1993 & 2003 (2nd edition)), *Legitimate Counterexamples to Unidirectionality* (Traugott 2001) and *Lexicalization and Language Change* (Brinton and Traugott 2005). It is worth comparing them to follow the development of the theory. These are as follows (my emphasis in bold):

1. [Grammaticalization is] the **process** whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, **continue to develop** new grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 1993: xv).

2. Grammaticalization is the **change** whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions or grammatical items **develop** new grammatical functions. (Traugott 2001: 1).

3. Grammaticalization is the change whereby in certain linguistic contexts **speakers** use parts of a construction with a grammatical function. Over time the resulting grammatical item **may** become more grammatical by acquiring more grammatical functions and **expanding its host-classes**. (Brinton and Traugott 2005: 99)

Definitions (1) and (2) appear to be almost identical, but there are two crucial differences between them, highlighted in bold. One is the use of ‘process’ in (1) and ‘change’ in (2). Traugott (2001: 3) herself explains that the reason behind the change in term is to eliminate “the idea that grammaticalization is distinct” because “it isn’t”. This change was prompted by the fact that many scholars interpreted the term ‘process’ as a distinct and determinate sequence, and that when they could not find one they reacted against the theory as flawed. Traugott stresses that studies of grammaticalization look at

1 ‘Gradual’ in this context refers to the step-by-step nature of changes rather than the time-period over which they take place, which may vary considerably from case to case.
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“all the minor changes that can lead to major catastrophic changes, as well as at the latter” (p. 3), and look at dynamic changes, not at comparisons between synchronic layers”. She qualifies grammaticalization as, at most, “strong tendencies” that we can identify as a part of language change.

The other difference between (1) and (2) is that (1) “implies that continued development of grammatical functions presupposes prior grammaticalization” (Traugott 2001: 3), thus inviting the “postulati[on] of a stage of language in which there were only lexical items” (p. 5). Traugott argues that this is “a creationist view of language development” and it “is in error” (p. 6). In order to avoid such extremist interpretations, she explains that shift in grammaticalization can happen in any of the following independent (not necessarily in seamlessly flowing) directions:

a. from lexical items → grammatical items
b. from less grammatical items ← more grammatical items
c. from older grammatical categories ← newer ones with the same approximate value

(Hopper & Traugott 2003: 23)

Traugott clearly states that not all lexical items change to grammatical items and qualifies, in her definitions above, that changes occur “in certain linguistic contexts”. This is supported by other Usage-Based Theory scholars such as Bybee (2005) and Ijbema (2002). In other words, grammaticalization is context-dependent and continued development is not always guaranteed.

Compared with (1) and (2), Traugott’s latest definition, (3), is much more specific. There are three major changes in (3) that are represented by the uses of three new terms – highlighted in bold above: ‘speakers’, ‘may’ and ‘host-classes’. First, the inclusion of ‘speakers’ implies discourse as a context for an innovation. Traugott stresses, “a theory of language change needs to be usage- or ‘utterance’-based, paying attention to meaning and discourse function” (Brinton & Traugott 2005: 9). This view derives from recent findings in studies using corpora of spoken languages and is also a warning against the approach of armchair grammarians whose bases for argument are often carefully constructed artificial examples and/or formal written texts. Second, the use of the word
‘may’ downplays the claims of continued development and suggests that it is conditional. Third, the phrase ‘expanding its host-classes’ means that grammaticalization generates productivity (growth in type frequency) and increased token frequency of the item that is being grammaticalized\textsuperscript{2}.

In addition, another major difference in (3) is the exclusion of ‘lexical items’, which is substituted with ‘parts of a construction’. This is presumably to fend off criticism that (1) and (2) postulate “a stage of language in which there were only lexical items”. It also excludes possibilities of grammaticalization completing the whole sequence from the lexical end to the grammatical end and gives an impression that the starting point of grammaticalization is, indeed, a grammatical item and the shift is from “less to more grammatical”. This is reflected in the identification of three levels of grammaticality with respect to degrees of fusion with external elements as follows:

- \(G_1\) = periphrases,
- \(G_2\) = semi-bound forms like function words and clitics,
- \(G_3\) = affixes such as derivational morphology that changes the grammatical class of the stem.

(Brinton and Traugott 2005: 93)

Brinton and Traugott (2005: 93) suggest that a typical instance of grammaticalization moves from \(G_1 > G_2 > G_3\).\textsuperscript{3} This and the exclusion of ‘lexical items’ from the definition suggest that recent theory of grammaticalization is concerned mainly with the grammatical end of word change.

---

\textsuperscript{2} For details of type and token frequencies, see ‘G, Frequency Effect (type & token)’ below.

\textsuperscript{3} Brinton and Traugott also identify three levels of lexicality and name them as \(L_1\), \(L_2\) and \(L_3\); these are in turn used to formulate the cline of lexicalization from \(L_1 > L_2 > L_3\). Lexicalization is identified by Brinton and Traugott (2005:144) as the “change whereby in certain linguistic contexts speakers use a syntactic construction or word formation as a new contentful form with formal and semantic properties that are not completely derivable or predictable from the constituents of the construction or the word formation pattern. Over time there may be further loss of internal constituency and the item may become more lexical”. However, this process is not directly related to the main investigation of this thesis and inclusion of it could cause confusions. Therefore detailed explanations are not given here. For more information on lexicalization, see the above book. Similarly, the shifts across the two categories, \(L_1 > G_1\) or \(G_1 > L_1\), seem to be included in neither grammaticalization nor lexicalization and no satisfactory explanation is given about their treatment of these throughout their book. This is contrary to Traugott’s earlier definition, which at least included ‘\(L_1 > G_1\)’ in grammaticalization as shown in Hopper & Traugott’s (2003) type ‘a’ above. Clearly, this is a much-disputed area and consensus has not been reached.
We have followed the changing definitions of grammaticalization focusing on Traugott’s publications. They illustrate the degree of confusion and dispute among scholars about the formulation of grammaticalization as a theory and suggest possible further modification to it. However, as Traugott (2001: 3) argues, there is no linguistic theory that commands a 100% claim, and empirically supportable strong tendencies may be better indicators of what constitutes language change than absolute universals. This is precisely where this thesis stands and its main investigations will involve the second stage of grammaticalization identified by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 23): the shift from less grammatical items to more grammatical items with expanding functions and host-classes.

(2) Grammaticalization: principles

Because Grammaticalization concerns change, it is often discussed in the discipline of historical linguistics, particularly, in the area of diachronic linguistics. But there are some synchronic issues that must be included as well. The following section will discuss some of the characteristics of grammaticalization that are particularly relevant to this study.

Diachronic Issues

A. Unidirectionality

Perhaps the most widely hypothesized tendency of Grammaticalization is its ‘unidirectionality’: it moves in one direction (e.g. from lexical to grammatical and not the other way round). Unidirectionality has been associated with grammaticalization from its beginning. Meillet (1912) tried to generalize that grammaticalization proceeds in a fixed direction, and Hopper and Traugott view it as “prototypically a unidirectional phenomenon” (2003:99). The following is the typical cline of unidirectional movement:

Content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix
be going to (a place) > be going to (future) > gonna >
This does not mean that changes always start from the far left and go through to the far right. Changes could start from any point of the cline and could stop after only one shift.

However, many scholars are sceptical of unidirectionality and the debate over its legitimacy has become heated since the early 1990s, with many counterexamples put forward. Newmeyer (1998: 226) claimed that "there is no such thing as grammaticalization" and Lightfoot argued that the search for unidirectionality is a holdover from the nineteenth century (1999).

As Traugott (2001: 3-4) pointed out, those who are against unidirectionality are seeking 100% validity of the hypothesis, which was, in the first place, no more than a strong tendency. She says, "grammaticalization grew out of functionalist thinking, and has always been associated with tendencies, not absolutes". Kiparsky suggests going back to the origin of grammaticalization (the Meillet-style conception of grammaticalization), which separated analogy and grammaticalization as categorically distinct. In doing so, he argues, "the apparent degrammaticalizations⁴ are in fact analytical changes which extend some grammatical pattern of the language to a new case" (2004: 1), therefore they do not contradict unidirectionality. Kiparsky does not consider analogy and grammaticalization to be mutually exclusive; instead they may, in some cases, converge and complement each other.

This study will not take a side at this stage as to whether grammaticalization moves in one direction or not. However, the case study of Soseki’s novels will no doubt present evidence to support one way or another.

**B. Generalization and specialization**

Other tendencies associated with grammaticalization are generalization and specialization. Generalization is the broadening of meanings, increase in polysemy, and wider distribution (Kurylowicz 1976:69, Hopper and Traugott 2003:101). Bybee (2003: 205) describes it as a process of "grams (grammatical morphemes) becoming more

---

⁴ Counterexamples of grammaticalization.
general and more abstract in their meaning, more widely applicable and more frequently used”. Generalization happens in both meaning and function. To take the example of ‘be going to’, it used to be always followed by place names and directions as in “I am going to London” and to indicate the physical movement. Gradually, it extended its range to verbs and began to be used in contexts like “I am going to eat at eight”. Later, it came to serve a larger and larger range of meaningful purposes until it was finally grammaticalized to indicate ‘future intentions’.

Specialization means reduction of choice and variety as a result of generalization (Breal 1991; Hopper 1991: 22). The choice of grammatical forms becomes reduced as certain ones become generalized in meaning and use, and metaphorically speaking, ‘monopolize the market’ and other less general ones fall out of use. In this sense, specialization is a result of generalization. However, specialization does not necessarily eliminate all other alternatives: some forms may simply be reduced in frequency and function, hence ‘specialized’. For instance, French negative had a variety of expressions such as ne ~ point, ne ~ mie, ne ~ beloce, ne ~ pas, etc. Gradually, ne ~ pas became the preferred choice and came to be used more widely and frequently, eventually ousting some varieties (e.g. mie, gote, areste) and making others (e.g. point, personne, que, plus) specialize (Schiffman 2003).

C. Decategorialization
Decategorialization is a loss of morphological and syntactical properties: a shift from major to minor or minor to major categories, e.g. the change in English while from a noun to a conjunction. Decategorialization was one of Meillet’s key mechanisms in grammaticalization. In the early definition of grammaticalization, only the shift from a major grammatical category such as noun or verb to a minor one such as auxiliary or suffix was considered to be important (see A. Unidirectionality, above). However, recent studies show that grammaticalization could move from a minor category to a major one: for example, in some African and Russian languages, discourse markers and interjections are said to be grammaticalized (e.g. turned into verbs) in regular ways
Whether to include this kind of change in the category of grammaticalization is a matter of dispute. It is often used as a counter-example of unidirectionality.

D. Renewal

Renewal is “a process whereby existing meanings may take on new forms” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 122). This is a process where a novel use of a particular term(s) gradually becomes commonplace and is accepted by the speech community over time. Often, but not always, these new terms or phrases are periphrastic, i.e. infrequently used terms or terms with restricted meanings and/or functions. For instance, instead of using an ordinary intensifier, very, one could invent a new one borrowed from the class of adverbs, such as awfully and terribly, to emphasize a negative situation: “He was awfully shocked” or “I am terribly sorry”. Over time, these expressions, too, become mundane and then using them in a positive expression becomes novel: “He is awfully excited” and “I am terribly happy”. Brinton and Traugott (2005: 45-6) call this familiarizing process ‘institutionalization’.

E. Morphologization (fusion)

Morphologization, also known as ‘compacting’, is the fusing of independent elements with each other. Fusion involves the freezing and fixing of collocations and seems to occur most typically when a particular word class (e.g. a verb) frequently collocates with a particular type of clitic (e.g. a complementizer), such as a phrasal verb, e.g., take a {walk, bath, leap} (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 142). Bybee (1985) shows in a survey of fifty languages, that causal relationships are often expressed in totally fused forms, rather than by inflectional forms, thus, suggesting semantic ‘relevance’ as a factor in fusion.

Synchronic issues: a synchronic result of unidirectionality

F. Layering

---

5 Brinton and Traugott (2005) classify decategorialization from a minor category to a major one as ‘lexicalization’ rather than grammaticalization.
Old forms may persist for a long period of time. The persistence of older forms and meanings alongside newer forms and meanings leads to an effect that can be called ‘layering’ or ‘variability’ at any one synchronic moment in time (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 124): within a broad functional domain, new layers are continually emerging; in the process the older layers are not necessarily discarded, but may remain to coexist with and interact with new layers (Hopper 1991: 22). This creates a period of overlap between older and newer functions.

G. Frequency Effect (token & type)
Frequency is considered to be a key measure of grammaticalization. This has been intuitively known for a long time. Advances in technology and computer-based investigations have enabled us to deal with a large volume of texts and deduce patterns based on statistical figures. Therefore, claims about regularities in change are generally statistical claims (Lewes 2002), at least in languages for which we have extensive research based on electronic texts.

There are two types of frequencies, ‘type frequency’ and ‘token frequency’. Type frequency means the number of items that are available to a particular class of forms. For instance, English past tense has several different forms, but the suffix -ed has the highest type frequency, occurring with thousands of verbs, while the form found in bought has a much smaller frequency, occurring with only a limited number of verbs (brought, thought, wrought, etc.) Type frequency can also be applied to the frequency of co-occurring items such as the number of different items that follow or precede a particular construction. This is closely linked to ‘generalization’ (see B above). Token frequency is the number of times a particular form (words or phrases), such as that or be going to, occur in texts. Bybee (2004: 3) suggests “the high token frequency of grammaticalizing phrases provides the triggering device for many of the changes that occur in the form and function of the grammaticalizing construction”. And two major effects of frequency of forms (token frequency) are Reduction Effect and Conservation Effect (Bybee and Thomson 1997).
a) Reduction Effect
Frequently used forms are more likely to be eroded at a faster rate than less frequently used ones (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 128).

Example: be going to → gonna
can not → cannot → can’t

b) Conservation Effect
Frequency results in the retention of irregular forms. Irregular verbs and nouns with irregular plural forms that are more frequently used have higher retention rate (e.g. go/went, man/men) than less frequently used ones (e.g. thrive/throve-thrived*, deer/deer-deers**). And a “combination of forms that occur more frequently tend to be automatized, that is, they are stored and uttered as a block“ (Boyland 1996) (e.g., catch up with, look alike). Also, the more frequently a word or phrase is used in speech or texts, the more grammatical and widespread it is assumed to be. (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 106, Bybee 2004: 4). The use of be going to for ‘future intentions’ is such an example. (*American English, **a term frequently misused)

Mechanisms: reanalysis and analogy
Reanalysis and analogy are often described as the two major mechanisms that lead to language change, of which grammaticalization is a part. According to Hopper and Traugott, reanalysis and analogy are distinctly different mechanisms and have different effects. Reanalysis (rule change/ innovation) essentially involves a linear, syntagmatic, often local, reorganization and rule change. It is not directly observable. On the other hand, analogy (rule generalization) mainly involves paradigmatic organisation, change in surface collocations, and in patterns of use spread across the linguistic system. Analogy makes the unobservable changes of reanalysis observable (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 68). Remember Saussure’s view of all endogenous change as analogical and Meillet’s reaction against it. As represented by Hopper and Traugott, Kiparsky and others, the latest consensus seems to be that both reanalysis and analogy are mechanisms crucial to language change and “grammaticalization does not occur without them” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 69).
In short, the mechanisms of grammaticalization work in the following stages.

i. a tiny local structural change emerges. (reanalysis/ innovation)
ii. frequency of (i) increases across linguistic types, styles, genres, and speakers
   (analogy/rule generalization)
iii. the change is accepted by the speech community (institutionalization).

Many neologisms reach the second stage but the third stage (institutionalization) is crucial to grammaticalization.

In summary, grammaticalization is a strong tendency of a change that starts as an innovation, then extends its functions and host-classes as it generalizes until finally it is accepted by the speech community as a norm. In the process it typically involves a number of characteristic changes that include, according to Brinton and Traugott (2005), semantic demotivation (loss of semantic compositionality), coalescence (loss of phonological segments), fusion (phonological reduction), decategorization (shift from a major category to a minor category), bleaching (loss of semantic meaning), subjectification, increased frequency and productivity, and typological generalization. It is also characterized by the unidirectional shift from less grammatical to more grammatical (unidirectionality).

(3) Language contact
From the field of studies in language contact, the mechanism of interference is the key to understanding the changes occurring at the turn of the twentieth-century in Japan. Theories of interference have been around for more than half a century. Weinreich, in his *Languages in Contact* (1953: 1), defined interference as “the rearrangement of patterns that result from the introduction of foreign elements into the more highly structured domains of language”. Loveday (1996: 14), following Weinreich, described interference as phonological, syntactic and semantic restructuring of a native language due to the influence of a foreign language. By replacing ‘rearrangement’ with ‘restructuring’, Loveday suggests that the change is not superficial and could, in some
cases, involve fundamental change in structure. Both Weinreich and Loveday are interested in the influence from foreign languages on native ones. However, in the discipline of second language acquisition, Hock & Joseph (1996: 376) view interference as “the influence of one’s native language on the structure of the acquired second language”.

As these definitions show, transfer resulting from interference is not unidirectional. It happens in both directions. It is a matter of degree and, once a word has been transferred from one language into another, the change does not stop there. The newly transferred word “is itself subject to the interference of the grammatical, as well as the phonic, system of the recipient language, especially at the hands of its unilingual speakers” (Weinreich 1953: 44) (see also Chapter 9). In addition, the reception of transferred forms is subject to a selective resistance inherent in the recipient grammar as well as in the prestige of the original language, as Toury (1995: 279) notes “even for one and the same text, neither interference nor tolerance of it are necessarily the same with respect to all linguistic and textual levels”.

Long before Weinreich, Linton identified introduction of a new cultural (including linguistic) element as involving the following stages:

1) its initial acceptance by innovators
2) its dissemination to other members of the society
3) the modifications by which it is finally adjusted to the pre-existing culture matrix.

(Linton 1940)

What is striking here is the similarity of the paths that grammaticalization and interference follow. Stage 1) correlates with reanalysis, stage 2) with generalization, and stage 3) with institutionalization. This suggests the possibility of integrating the two approaches.

(4) Contact-induced grammaticalization
As Gildea (2000) notes, few linguists practice comparative linguistics and grammaticalization theory, yet both of these fields of study belong to the broader
category of historical linguistics. Research on grammaticalization seems to be largely confined to mono-linguistic situations. Bybee who surveyed fifty languages with respect to grammaticalization was intent on finding universal strategies in each language but not interested in cross-linguistic contact situations. On the other hand, the field of language contact (which is a part of comparative-historical linguistics) is restricted to certain areas: it is focused on various phenomena such as borrowing, interference, pidginization and diglossia, and does not seem to have established a universal theory applicable across communities. However, this does not mean that there is a lack of interest in the wider picture of language contact and change. For example, Traugott (2003: 230) herself strongly suggests that contact has been “an important factor for most languages, and a strictly monogenetic view of grammaticalization is ultimately inappropriate”. She further stresses that the “study of the development of mixed languages demands that more attention be paid to multiple origins of grammatical structure”.

This research follows Traugott’s view on contact and also takes up a position stated by Heine and Kuteva (2003: 529) that “the two [grammaticalization and contact-induced change] are in no way mutually exclusive, rather, ... they jointly conspire in triggering grammatical change”. The term “contact-induced grammaticalization” is created to integrate the two approaches (Heine & Kuteva 2003). Language change is a complex and multi-layered process, which employs various mechanisms triggered by different causal factors. The situation in turn of the twentieth-century Japan presents itself as an excellent example of this complexity: a long history of diglossia (centuries of distant bilingual contact with Chinese), translation culture, sudden contact with the West, the creation of modern vernacular writing, etc. It seems appropriate to approach the language of this era from a multi-disciplinary point of view and attempt to uncover and explain the mechanisms with multi-faceted methods.

---

6 Some of the exceptions are Keesing’s (1991) study on Tok Pisin and Melanesian Pidgin and Bruyn’s (1996) study on Sranan Creole.
2.2.2 Translation studies
Similar to language contact, in the field of translation, Toury (1995: 274-9) formulates a law of interference and states, “in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to be transferred to the target text”. Howland (2002: 4) notes that the new terms transferred from one language to another were “both transformative and transformed in the process of translation”. These statements largely overlap with Weinreich’s comments on interference. However, while contact linguists are focused on the transfer of foreign elements into another language, ignoring translation, the focus of translation studies is the transfer of foreign elements into translated texts. The interference in translated texts is, in a sense, a halfway point between the source language and interference in the recipient language. The theory of interference in translation will be the main framework for the investigation of the relationship between a large volume of Japanese translation from western literature and modern Japanese creative writing in Chapter 9.

2.3 Methods
2.3.1 Corpus linguistics: quantitative analysis
This study aims to examine empirical data based on analyses of a large volume of texts. In the absence of electronic corpora and appropriate technology, previous studies have tended to focus on individual works or small quantities of text. Here, the entire body of Soseki’s novels, the major works of Ogai’s and the novels of several other writers are investigated using two CD-ROMs (Meiji no bungō and Taishō no bungō) as well as an online texts collection, Aozora bunko.

The corpus analysis can

- provide a basis for the preliminary survey of texts (a simple and quick key word search can provide data for preliminary survey and help to restructure further investigation)
• indicate tendencies in the uses of individual words within texts
• show distribution patterns within particular texts and compare differences between texts
• be used to identify narrative patterns and significant syntactic patterns.

Corpus analysis helps to find unexpected facts and tendencies in texts and is useful for identifying individual differences in writing as well as general patterns of use of particular words and phrases. In short, it is a useful tool to test both existing and new hypotheses, and indeed, to generate new hypotheses.

This study employs inductive methods that combine quantitative and qualitative analyses. Literary studies have been sceptical of data-driven investigations and until recently, have made few attempts to pay attention to actual frequencies of linguistic features. Consequently, their research tends to be selective and often subjective. For instance, several scholars have mentioned that the use of third person pronouns are increasing (cf. Yanase 2000, Morioka 1999), that the second person pronoun anata seems to be appearing where it was not previously used (Ikeda 1980), and that the use of anata to address older or superior persons was not necessarily a taboo before the Second World War (Miwa 2000). They do so, however, without giving much evidence. Even when there is some statistical evidence as in Koike’s (1994) research on third person pronouns in Soseki’s works, the figures are not exhaustive and there is no explanation of how he acquired them (see section 3.6.2).

Quantitative analysis is used to test hypotheses based on informed impressions or selective investigations by constructing more complex statistical data. However, this method alone could not construct an accurate picture of change. Qualitative analysis is necessary in order to identify detailed uses and sort out the data acquired from the quantitative analysis into further sub-categories.
2.3.2 Qualitative analysis

Following the corpus-based quantitative investigations, qualitative methods are applied to investigate further the detailed distributions of pronouns to characters, particular situations, and age and gender, in order to find explanations for changes identified by the frequency patterns. In this process, data generated through corpora are organized in a way that the change is statistically and graphically observable. Tendencies demonstrated through corpus-based analyses are then compared with those of grammaticalization and interference theories in order to test whether the pronoun change in Japanese can indeed be characterised as grammaticalization, or whether it presents a unique case or adds some new aspect to theory.

The data is presented in several formats – tables, charts, figures and examples. Normalised figures of per 100,000 characters are generally used when a comparison between novels of different lengths is required, e.g. the comparison of 3PP frequencies across Soseki’s 13 novels (Charts 5-A to 5-D). In some cases, raw figures are presented when they are considered to be more meaningful than normalised figures, e.g. when the focus is on the time of appearance (Tables 4-5 and 8-6), variety of referents (Tables 8-7, 8-8 and 8-10) and variety of annotations and forms (Tables 8-4 and 8-5) of particular pronouns. Explanations of the different methods (whether the data is computer-generated, manually counted or a combination of both) are given in each chapter where statistical data is presented.

While motivations for institutionalisation are social, the thesis avoids detailed explanations of social and political issues of the time. This is mainly because they are not the focus of the study and also because there have been numerous publications on these themes including Howland’s Translating the West: Languages and Political Reason in Nineteenth-Century Japan (2002), Loveday’s Language Contact in Japan (1996) and Karatani’s Origins of Modern Japanese Literature (1993). Interested readers should refer to these and other publications listed in Appendix B.
2.4 Conclusion

The main theoretical framework of this thesis is grammaticalization theory and its principles are tested with empirically acquired data through the corpus-based investigations. Furthermore, the chosen period of study naturally leads to approaches from language contact and translation theories. Theories and methods from these four disciplines are integrated in order to portray a clearer picture of the complex pronoun change that took place in the two decades that were equally complex and transitional in the history of Japan.

The integrated approach will help:

- give reliable data to theoretical formulations by making full use of technology and the source material available,
- give another historical dimension to existing linguistic studies on pronouns by combining approaches from language internal investigation (e.g. grammaticalization) and contact-based analysis (e.g. interference),
- contribute to the understanding of the mechanism of language transfer by introducing methods of translation studies as a ‘half way point’ in language contact.
- Add to our understanding of an important period of language change in the Japanese system of pronouns, as part of larger change around the turn of the twentieth century - namely, the formation of a modern writing style,
- improve our appreciation of literature by shedding new light on character relationships, narrative and syntactic patterns, and historical elements that can be identified by the use of pronouns and clusters generated around them.

Lastly, although pronoun change may at first seem of small significance in the larger picture, it may also be presented as a microcosm of the creative process. Many dimensions of pronoun change to be seen in the turn of the 20th century are in fact reflections of the transformation of Japanese writing from the Edo fiction to the Modern novels as demonstrated in Chapters 6 and 7.
Chapter 3

Previous research on the use of personal pronouns

That the grammar of honorifics is highly sensitive to social change can be seen by the reappearance of personal pronouns in several areas of discourse in present-day Japanese.

(Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 75)

3.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises the key principles and attitudes evident in the work of prominent scholars who have been engaged in the study of personal pronouns across several disciplines.

First, the chapter asks why the kare 3PPs have been excluded from grammatical and socio-linguistic studies in Japanese or, put another way, why the focus has been on the 1PP and 2PP and the ko-so-a set of the 3PPs? It will also follow the relevant works from the last 100 years, and in the process, will identify various characteristics of the kare 3PPs that are not found in the other sets of personal pronouns.

Second, it will follow those areas of study, such as historical linguistics, translation studies and literary criticism, in which the kare 3PPs have been better represented. These areas are almost invariably tied to contact situations, including the contact with Chinese, European languages, modern European literature, and translation. The fact that various contact situations generated the use of the kare 3PPs in Japanese writing has been known for the last 50 years, and several scholars have investigated each situation with some significant findings. However, ‘how’ these types of contact have contributed to the increased use of the kare 3PPs is less known: there is little research with empirical data, partly because analysing a large volume of material that reaches over a long period, sometimes centuries, is time-consuming and beyond the capacity of a researcher.
This is where a new method of linguistic investigation, corpus linguistics, comes into play. Computer-generated analysis of electronic texts has created a faster and easier way of processing large volume of data, and been making large-scale contributions in both diachronic and synchronic linguistic research. It has shown itself to be a vital tool for empirical investigation.

The contrasts between the first two sets of disciplinary areas above foreshadow the structure and content of later chapters as they focus upon various aspects of the kare 3PPs which are central to this work - namely, the process of change in the use of the kare 3PPs and their relationship with the modern colloquial novel, especially third person narrative writing.

3.2 Exclusion of kare 3PPs

There are a number of related disciplinary areas that deal with personal pronouns in general. These include Japanese grammar and socio-linguistics. While a significant body of academic literature on Japanese personal pronouns in these areas exists, studies which deals with the 3PP, especially the kare type, is relatively under-represented. This under-representation is important as it reflects scholars’ attitudes towards and understanding of personal pronouns. This is partly due to the honorific function of Japanese pronouns. Bachnik et al. state forcefully “that the honorific system penetrates the whole of the language” (quoted in Mühlhäusler and Harré 1990: 159). As the target of respect is most frequently the second person, and of corresponding humility most frequently the first, scholars are inclined to look at discourse situations where I and you are the main players. However, the 3PP, especially kare, kanojo and karera (the kare 3PPs), seem to be part of a system that does not quite fit into the definitions and strong honorific overtone of first and second personal pronouns. For this reason, as explained in section 1.4, the kare 3PPs are often excluded from grammatical and sociolinguistic research, which will be further discussed in the sections that follow.
3.2.1 Socio-linguistic approaches
The study of social aspects of personal pronouns is an enormous and varied area with a significant history and body of theory attached to it. There are many papers that discuss the use and nature of personal pronouns, particularly in relation to honorifics. There is an overwhelming emphasis in these discussions on the mechanism of social interaction as opposed to other elements, such as paradigmatic, referential/substituting and stylistic aspects; consequently, the main focal points are the first and second person pronouns. Studies on honorifics have grown from a grammatical and historical background leading to publications with titles such as History of Honorifics (Tsujimura 1971), Honorifics (Ōno and Shibata 1977), Japanese and Society (Suzuki 1975) and Pronouns and People (Mühlhäusler & Harré 1990), and content that is largely concerned with interaction between speaker and addressee covering such topics as politeness, social hierarchy, face, etc.

For example, Tsujimura (1977: 88) claims the most fundamental aspect of Japanese honorifics is their relativity: a) they function as honorifics only when contrasted with non-honorific terms; and b) the speaker can change the use or non-use and the degree of respect according to whom they are speaking to. The latter is especially apparent in the use of personal pronouns.

Mühlhäusler & Harré (1990: 160) also state, “learning the [Japanese] language and learning the nature of society and the place of people, including oneself, (...) are not just correlative happenings, but indeed the very same process”. Their argument is based on Bachnik’s remark that in Japanese “it is not possible to speak without defining one’s relationship vis a vis the addressee” (1981: 21), emphasizing the importance of knowing one’s place in the society, in other words, knowing which pronoun to use according to the situation.

Japanese personal pronouns in an attempt to identify the source of Japanese reluctance to engage in structured arguments. He suspects that the highly developed and intricate Japanese honorific system may be a hindrance to dispassionate argument. He investigates Japanese first and second person pronouns in discourse situations in comparison to other (mainly European) languages. He argues that the hierarchy of the speaker and the addressee determines the choice of a personal pronoun in Japanese, and the first and second pronouns in a speech situation are often not interchangeable, and therefore asymmetrical (p. 66). He concludes that Japanese personal pronouns are not ‘universal and absolute’ (in the sense that they can be used for anyone) as in English but ‘relative’ (in the sense that the relationship between the speaker and the addressee – power, social standing, age, gender, etc. – determines the choice of a pronoun). He suggests the future of Japanese personal pronouns will be more neutral and less hierarchical.

By comparison, Ōno (2000) divides Japanese personal pronouns into two categories: the hierarchical system and proximity system. In the hierarchical system, the speaker judges whether the addressee is above or below him/her and treats him/her accordingly. In the proximity system, the addressee’s position is measured according to the distance from the speaker: closeness signifies intimacy/casualness and remoteness respect/formality. He proposes that the former has an origin in China and its bureaucracy and the latter in native Japanese. The ko-so-a-do paradigm raised by Sakuma (1936) is a typical example of the latter.

All these studies on honorifics focus on discourse situations and, inevitably, on the first and second pronouns. The 3PP is only mentioned within a confinement of the ko-so-a-do system. The kare 3PPs are often excluded from the investigation, as is the case in grammatical studies, because they defy conventional definitions of personal pronouns.

3.2.2 Grammatical studies
The honorific focus is also strong in grammatical studies. This is evident in the way personal pronouns are defined and categorised in many Japanese grammar books. There are numerous books and articles on the issue and it is impossible to name them all.
Ötsuki, who edited the first modern Japanese grammar, *Kōnibunbunten* (1897), grouped pronouns with nouns following his study of English grammar. Matsushita (1901 & 1930), Yamada (1936) and Hashimoto (1948) supported his argument and grouped them as nouns with strong honorific connotation.

However, later, scholars started to look at Japanese pronouns in their own right and came up with different definitions. Perhaps the most well known, and one of the earliest, is Sakuma’s theory. Sakuma (1936) described a model based on the *ko-so-a-do* theory in which the importance of three fields — *ko, so* and *a* — is the key to understanding both the identity and functions of demonstratives of which pronouns are a part². He is explicit in identifying the importance of the speech situation, where the fields around the speaker and the addressee are defined by both physical and psychological distance. Mikami (1972) pushed Sakuma’s theory further and states that Japanese pronouns rarely represent, but rather ‘demonstrate’; therefore they have to be categorized with demonstratives. This is supported by Tokieda (1978) whose definition of pronouns is not the representation of physical objects or concepts but the demonstration of the relationship between the speaker and the content of his/her utterance.

The definitions of personal pronouns by the two groups of scholars above appear very different, but their viewpoints seem very similar. In some ways, the similarity is greater than the difference; what is important to them is honorific function of personal pronouns in a discourse situation. In most of these studies, the *kare* 3PPs are excluded. To explain this exclusion, Sakuma (1957: 32) notes, “Terms like *kare* have a flavour of translation and are not used in speech”. Mikami (1972: 184-9) agrees “*kare, karera, kanojo* and *kanojora* are the product of translation” and “when they are a threat to the existing *ko-so-a-do* system, they are met with a very strong resistance”. Likewise, Shōho (1984: 60) separates *kare* and *kanojo* from the *ko-so-a-do* system because they “are almost always

---

¹ Japanese demonstratives form a deictic system (pointing function) categorised by the physical and psychological proximity to the speaker/writer and each indicated by a common first syllable, *ko* for ‘near distance’, *so* for ‘middle distance’ and *a* for ‘far distance’. In fact, together with the interrogative, *do*, they form a very neat system called the *ko-so-a-do* paradigm (see section 1.3 in Chapter 1, Sakuma (1936) and Mikami (1955) for detailed explanations of this system).

² The last field, *do*, is an interrogative, therefore its function is different from the other three.
used when the referent is absent from the discourse situation and therefore, do not have a demonstrative function”.

Thus, it has become clear that the commonly accepted definition of Japanese 3PPs among modern grammarians and linguists is that they are demonstratives and, together with the 1PP and 2PP in discourse situations, form a sub-category of personal pronouns. This definition excludes automatically the *kare* type, which does not conform. This explains why words of this set are uniformly absent from the study of demonstratives and pronouns. However, none of the above scholars provide further analysis or explanation of how the *kare* type differs from the other sets of personal pronouns. To investigate the nature of the *kare* 3PPs and identify their function and use is one of the main aims of this thesis.

3.3 Contact situations and *kare* 3PPs

The areas of study in which the *kare* 3PPs have most extensively been investigated are historical linguistics and translation studies. The former normally focuses on the period beginning with large-scale Japanese contact with the West in the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century. The latter often deals with the outcome of this contact and the implications for present translation practice. In addition to these, there has been a new trend to view the Japanese language within an Asian cultural block, focusing on the relationship with Chinese (*kanbun*), which had long been regarded as High variety in several satellite nations, including Korea, Taiwan, and Viet Nam. This line of enquiry inevitably deals with a much longer period, often spanning over a millennia but stops before the beginning of the modern era (the late 19th century). Thus creating a vacuum: the transitional period and process, during which European languages, especially English, took over from Chinese as the most influential foreign language in Japan, have hardly been investigated. Also, linguistic studies tend to exclude translation as something not

---

3 *Kanbun* is a formal style of Chinese writing used in Chinese classical literature such as the *Analects of Confucius* and historical epics. Modern Chinese is quite different from *kanbun*. 
quite Japanese, overlooking its influence on creative writing. However, the boundary between translation and creative work was, as Tanizaki (1929: 172) says, often blurred in this period (see also section 9.5).

The following section will show how closely contact situations and the *kare* 3PPs have been linked in Japanese linguistic history, and the contributions of historical linguistics and translation studies to the investigation of this link.

### 3.3.1 Historical linguistics

There has been much speculation on the connection between the *kare* 3PPs and the influence of European languages for some time. Research by Hirota (1969) and Okumura (1954) are two of the earliest comparative studies on the 3PP and have become standard points of reference.

Hirota investigates the birth and growth of *kanojo (she)* from the beginning of the Meiji period to WWII (1868 to 1939). He provides a general update on the development of *kanojo* as a 3PP in literary writing and then suggests that the influence from Western languages, especially in translation, is the key factor responsible for its increased use. Okumura follows a similar line of inquiry but includes other components of the *kare* 3PPs, *kare* (*he*) and *karera* (*they*). He classifies these as a new type of 3PP, distinct from the traditional Japanese 3PPs, the *ko-so-a* type pronouns. Through his investigation of novels between 1768 and 1941, Okumura concludes that the *kare* 3PPs were introduced to fill a functional gap that had been vacant in the Japanese language and did not displace anything preexistent. This view will be challenged later in Chapter 6. Although these theories are backed with figures, the research was carried out before the era of electronic corpora. Therefore, the breadth of source texts and method of counting show limitations. Similar to Hirota, Yanabu (1996) searched the history of *kare* and *kanojo* and found some of their earliest use as 3PPs in Dutch-Japanese translation in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. He follows their development through selected novels and concludes, contrary to Okumura’s theory that *kare* and *kanojo* came into existence in Japanese literature as something extra or unnecessary. He suggests that their appearance in Meiji novels was
something of a novelty but gained a special position in Japanese language through repeated use. This view is further elaborated in Chapter 6. Fundamentally, however, he believes that Japanese does not have 3PPs.

While the focus of the above scholars has been on literary writing, some other scholars used other types of material. Sōgo (1988) and Hida (2002) followed the history of kanojo through their separate investigation of Kokutei tokuhon (National Readers) used in schools during the Meiji period, in their respective books: Nihongo kaika monogatari (Stories of Japanese Modern Terms) and Meiji umareno nihongo (The Meiji-born Japanese). Similar to Yanabu, they suggest that kanojo was a product of Dutch-Japanese translation in the late Edo period and gradually developed throughout the Meiji period among the intellectuals. They also demonstrate the extensive use of translated texts in Japanese language textbooks. This further supports the wider influence of translation on Japanese writing. The shortcomings of their studies are that their primary aim is set to identify the time when the two-character word 彼女 began to be pronounced as kanojo and they do not go much further in exploring its function, nor that of kare and karera. Therefore, their studies show only a limited aspect of the kare 3PP.

In summary, all of the above scholars are united in their opinions that the kare 3PPs were introduced into Japanese recently (just over a century ago) through the translation of European texts and are items of an alien nature.

Li Cho Ha’s recent work (2002), however, presents a different view. His work is more analytical and certainly more polemical in advocating a certain approach to the method and goals of the historical research. With regard to methods, Li argues for placing the development of Japanese language within the paradigm of Asian culture and avoiding a Western-oriented approach that ignores the important input and aspirations of Chinese literature. He compares the historical changes in Japanese demonstratives, including personal pronouns, with those in Chinese and finds a strong link between them. He argues that, throughout history, kare has had a degree of interaction with Chinese, starting from annotation of the character 彼 in Old Chinese texts in the eighth century, to
translation of Chinese vernacular novels in the late 19th century. Thus he suggests that the prolonged contact with Chinese laid the foundation for the new contact with European languages and further change of the kare 3PPs.

Although the scope of Li’s investigation is extensive both in terms of time span (from the seventh century B.C. to the 19th century) and source texts (from the Analects of Confucius to Edo story telling), his research stops before the Meiji period and consequently does not explain the vital transition from Chinese influence on the kare 3PPs to that of English, the separation of kanojo and karera from kare, nor their established uses in the modern colloquial literature.

How these issues are explained in the area of translation studies, which also deals with contact situations, will be the focus of the following section.

3.3.2 Translation studies

Translators, who deal with a number of languages at a time, often feel strongly about the issue of personal pronouns. Yanase (1996: 126-134) stresses that “when translating into Japanese, it is a common practice to delete personal pronouns” and advocates the eradication of them in translation. The incredible feat of his translation of James Joyce’s Ulysses without any kare 3PPs is well known. His view is based on his long experience as a literary translator and belief that the Japanese language naturally does not require any personal pronouns. It is also an indication of the proliferation of pronouns in translated texts that caused him to speak out against their use of them.

Murakami (1996: 59) is another translator who raises a question about personal pronouns in Japanese. He states that the hardest things to translate are personal pronouns; therefore how to deal with pronouns is the ultimate question of Japanese translation. Both Yanase and Murakami came to realise through experience that there are too many personal pronouns in translation, but their claims are essentially speculative rather than analytical. They do not give any reliable data that support their speculation, however well informed. Ironically, Murakami’s translation of English texts appears to have more personal
pronouns than is normal in Japanese literary texts (e.g. his translations of Augie Wren's Christmas Story by Paul Auster, 1997 and Collectors by Raymond Carver, 1975). Their experiences are not isolated cases but typical of Japanese translators.

The dilemma of translators has an origin in the foreignness of the kare 3PPs repeatedly raised through reference to linguists and grammarians in previous sections. How these foreign elements (whether they are really foreign to Japanese has to be questioned and will be discussed in section 5.2.1 in Chapter 5, but is left purposely unquestioned at the moment) came into existence has been partially investigated by Morioka (1999).

Morioka (1999) has developed a number of propositions based on his investigation of dictionaries and language texts published in the Meiji period. He portrays the formation of a new style of writing created through the translation of Western texts. A whole Chapter is devoted to pronouns. His focus is on how pronouns are translated into Japanese. He gives a long list of terms that appeared in various dictionaries as well as numerous Dutch-Japanese and English-Japanese parallel sentences used in language textbooks. He found a clear pattern of translation according to the nationalities of translators. The texts translated by Japanese native scholars contained more personal pronouns than those by non-Japanese. He suggests that this is due to different attitudes towards translation: Western translators, especially missionaries, preferred free translation with colloquial Japanese rather than literal translation; but Japanese translators preferred word-for-word translation with formal Japanese.

Christian missionaries, as a rule, translate in a more accessible colloquial form, whatever language they are dealing with, for obvious reasons; in order to convert as many people as possible. Without this ulterior motive, Japanese translators (mainly educated males) chose a style which was familiar to them; kanbun kundoku style (a formal writing style based on kanbun). This was the standard medium of writing among the educated class, and also among the translators of the Dutch language during the Edo and early Meiji periods. From these findings, Morioka (1999: 155-7) speculates that: the origins of kare and kanojo go back to the translation of Dutch hij (he) and zij (she) in the Edo period;
these words established themselves as 3PPs around the 1900s; and the method of literal translation contributed to the liberal use of pronouns in Japanese (pp. 156-67).

While Morioka’s research is extensive with a list of numerous entries of the kare 3PPs in the late Edo and Meiji publications and is often credited with making the connection between Dutch-Japanese and English-Japanese translations, it comes short of explaining the process of the transition, as was the case in other research referred to so far. The insights into capturing the process of change, in fact, come from literary studies.

3.3.3 Literary studies
Although literary studies do not necessarily deal with the intricate details of personal pronouns, they do provide a vital source of insights into language change. Among them, narratology and historical approaches to literature have been expanding areas of research in the past few decades. A number of literary critics such as Komori, Noguchi and Karatani writing for the journal Hihyō kukan (The Critical Space), have made a considerable contribution to theoretical investigation of modern novel writing.

These scholars have a similar line of enquiry. Their main concern is narrative: the narrator, narrative tense and space (see Komori 1988a and 1988b, Noguchi 1994 and Karatani 1996). They view Edo fiction as primarily first person narrative stories told in the present tense. The narrator is always present in the story and tells the reader what he/she sees and hears. This style was appropriate when a variety of fiction divided readers and each enjoyed its own unique readership. Writers knew exactly what kind of target readers they were addressing to. However, when the Meiji writers started to address a large and anonymous readership, a new way of telling a story was needed. Third person narrative was the answer and in turn it brought the past tense as a fictional tense and third person pronouns as terms of reference into the modern novel. Noguchi (1994) suggests the established use of the non-honorific, neutral past tense form, ta, as a key to the increased frequency of personal pronouns, especially the 3PP. His theory is full of insights and tries to pull together many threads from different aspects of Japanese literature in order to explain “the discovery of third person narrative” by the Japanese in
the late 19th century but stops at that point and does not follow the development of the newly discovered narrative form and the 3PP into the 20th century.

Similarly, Komori (1988a: 56) views the relationship of dialogue to narrative one of the critical issues of early modern Japanese literature. Many writers struggled to find a right style to bridge the gap. He takes Soseki as an example and explains that his transitional state as a novelist who experienced both the Edo oral tradition and 19th century English literature, is manifested in his choice of the first person narrator in his early works. The first half of his career reflects his struggle to find a new kind of literature that was intended for circulation through the medium of a newspaper to a large, anonymous, and dispersed audience.

At about the same time, as Karatani and his fellow scholars were involved in The Critical Space, on the other side of the Pacific, a group of scholars, including Sakai, Miyoshi and Fujii, were pursuing the same issues, focusing on narrative writing. In doing so, they all encounter with Soseki whose life and career became parallel to the linguistic and literary shifts of the time, and in turn, became the embodiment of the transition.

Miyoshi (1974: xiii-xv), talking about modern Japanese novels, argues that the language is “probably the most significant element in any discussion of Japanese fiction”. He lists the following as the important aspects of Japanese: first, ‘the large divergence between the spoken and the written language’; second, ‘the system of honorifics’, third, ‘the floating tense and loose syntactic form’. His description of Japanese fiction is as follows:

> Often grammatical person shifts around very freely from first to third, and from one first-person speaker to another first-person speaker. More importantly, we see everywhere – even in Soseki – a free shift in the point of view, and even in the narrative mode, from the third-person novel to the first-person diary, confession, or letter. **(Accomplices of Silence, 1974, p. xi)**

This stresses the constant shift of grammatical person in narrative writing. Miyoshi’s view supported by Noguchi (1994: 7) who believes that Edo fiction did not know the first person and third person distinctions. At the same time he is not reluctant to admit “the theoretical basis of Soseki’s understanding of English literature” is “so prominent in his
own ‘Japanese’ fiction’ (p. 61). He goes on to say that “his knowledge of the English
language ‘helped’ him forge a new language for the Japanese novel” (p. 61). He implies
that Soseki’s writing is a hybrid of the two cultures. This contrasts with naturalist writers’
(whose foreign languages skills were often questionable) superficial borrowing of
Western terms and rhetoric. This is also the point made by Weinrich (1953: 44) in
Chapter 2 and will be further examined in Chapter 9 with case studies.

Fujii (1993: 109-111), in his Complicit Fictions, compares nineteenth-century Western
literature, which had a narrative without ‘the speaking subject’, with the Japanese
language that almost automatically encodes markers identifying the speaker of a
sentence. Modern Japanese novels (Fujii’s ‘prose fiction’) tried to neutralize the speaking
subject by the ‘standardization of narratives’ employed by 19th century Western novelists.
He argues that Soseki’s earliest novels challenge this “by employing an orational style”
that was a legacy of Edo literature. In other words, Soseki’s choice of first person
narrative and the polysemic characteristic of language in these novels were conscious acts
of resistance against ‘monologic’ (i.e., defined by a single perspective) genbunichi
novels produced by the naturalist writers of his time. This view is supported by Karatani
(1996), although Tanizaki (1931: 58) makes a remark on Soseki’s writing as a fellow
novelist, in which he suggests that the influence of naturalist movement was so strong in
the early 1900s that no one, even established writers such as Soseki and Ogai, was free
from it. While these comments appear to contradict each other, they illustrate the
transformation of Soseki’s writing from a style closer to Edo colloquial fiction to the one
influenced by Western generated literary movement.

In addition to the oral nature of Edo fiction, Sakai (1991: 266-336) suggests the
importance of kanbun kundoku in the Edo period. He views the following Meiji period as
the collapse of the distance mediated by the Chinese language due to the cultural invasion
from the West, especially from English. He concludes that in both cases, external forces
motivated the change, stressing the existence of kanbun kundoku (the peculiarly Japanese
way of reading Chinese texts) as a mediator between Chinese and Japanese; that the
Japanese finally realised what they had believed was Japanese (kanbun kundoku) was in
fact neither Japanese nor Chinese; and this mediatory system was displaced by the onset of a new colloquial writing motivated by Western influence in the Meiji period.

The picture of Meiji fiction painted by these literary commentators is that of a crossroads between oral tradition and modern narrative, the first person and third person, Chinese and English, speech and writing, and internal and external influences. And Soseki’s novels very much represent all of these characteristics. Each of these dichotomies will be further investigated in later chapters.

3.4 Studies in other languages

Although, this thesis focuses on Japanese 3PPs, studies of personal pronouns in other languages can give invaluable insights. The ones referred to here do not automatically accept conventional views and approaches, rather they challenge them and find that widely accepted views on personal pronouns are often based on introspection, made-up examples, and perceptions of grammatical correctness rather than actual use. They also find linguistic varieties and cultural contexts as important elements of personal pronouns.

Freyne’s The Strange Case of On (1990: 178–92, in Mühlhäusler and Harré) is one such study. He describes a chameleon like character of the French on: the extreme adaptability and the wide range of the uses of this highly flexible pronoun. He notes “the use of on in place of one of the personal pronouns je, tu, nous, vous, il/elle, ils/elles, is a feature above all of the spoken language, where it is extremely widespread” (p.180) and investigates each case. His argument is statistically supported: on is 12th on the frequency list of the Gougenheim corpus, ahead of some basic words such as un (14th), une (23rd), qui (20th), the negative non and nous (46th) (Gougenheim et al., 1956, quoted in Freyne). His research identifies an apparent gap between the textbook grammar and the colloquial proliferation of on that could pose a problem for learners of French. This echoes the Japanese grammarians persistent exclusion of the kare 3PPs until recently, while they have been widely used in both writing and speech for some time.
Perhaps, the research closer to this thesis is Liu’s (1995) examination of Chinese modern 3PPs. She shows how the contact with the West in the early 20th century caused the creation of a gender difference in the Chinese 3PP. The traditional Chinese 3PP 他 (ta) was genderless as indicated by the radical 人 (ren, person) on the left-hand side of the compound character and it had not occurred to them that they had to create a gender difference in it until their encounter with the West. According to Liu, some Chinese felt a deficiency in the Chinese language because of the lack of the female 3PP and tried to create one. After a few attempts, they settled with 她 by replacing the radical 人 with 女 (woman) and 他 remained in use as the male 3PP. They also created an animal/neutral form 牠 with a radical 牛 (cow). The creation of new 3PPs satisfied the need for a gender difference in the 3PP, at least, visually. However, because these three 3PPs share the same ‘phonetic’ element, 他, they cannot be phonetically differentiated: all are pronounced /ta/. Attempts have been made to somehow differentiate them, for instance, /t'α/ for 他 and /t'uo/ for 她, but have never succeeded. Now, while 她 is widely used in writing, Liu is of the opinion that no one is certain how it should be pronounced. This illustrates not only language change generated in a contact situation, but also, and more importantly, the ideographic and visual nature of Chinese writing. The problem of reading a particular kanji word is also paramount in Japanese. For instance, the female 3PP, 彼女, presents multiple possibilities. This issue is the focus of Chapter 8.

For English, Wales (1996) proposed the first comprehensive analysis of personal pronouns devoted to present-day English. Against the conservative and prescriptive views on personal pronouns in grammar-books, she uses data from everyday English that she had collected between 1980 and 1995, in addition to data from a number of corpora, for her empirical observations. She brings out a diverse use of personal pronouns that is often ignored or taken for granted by traditional grammarians. She investigates various functions of the 3PP and criticises the popular traditional definition of the 3PP as substitution, especially, ‘anaphoric’ reference (‘referring back’). She demonstrates much more diverse uses that include ‘cataphoric’ (‘forward-looking’), and ‘exophoric’ (‘contextual or situational’) reference as well as deictic function.
Mühlhäusler and Harré's *Pronouns and People* (1990) is an ambitious work that tries to uncover both the universal and non-universal aspects of pronouns by investigating as many languages as they could from a socio-linguistic point of view. They start by asking "why linguistic views on this topic [pronouns] have concentrated on an arbitrarily narrow and peripheral aspect (anaphoricity)?" They argue that it is because linguists often use "artificially constructed sentence units or highly monitored forms of discourse" to formulate the so-called 'normal' use of pronouns instead of the considerably more common ones in everyday contexts (p. 15). Their emphasis is on "the importance of pronouns as indicators of the complex relationships between selves and the societies these selves live in" (p. 47). Through their research, they list the two basic features as being universal: (1) ‘person’ or the features of participant roles, (2) distance and proximity (obviative and proximative), both spatial and social. They then add the following as optional features: (3) number, (4) gender, (5) kinship status, (6) social status, (7) others, and (8) markedness (p. 64). These features form a useful guide for pronoun research but linguistic varieties and cultural contexts have to be taken into account before they are applied. They also find, contrary to the common view shared by prescriptive linguists that of all parts of speech, personal pronouns are the least liable to change their form (p. 275), that pronoun systems can be highly sensitive to social factors and that forces such as taboo, mixing and gradual shift of meaning can promote far-reaching changes in pronouns and pronoun use (p. 249).

Mühlhäusler and Harré conclude with two claims: "(a) that the anaphoric function of pronominals is much less important than generally supposed, if not marginal, to human communication and (b) that the development from less complex to more complex pronoun (deictic) systems progresses along language-independent lines" (p. 269). And external factors, such as language contact, may determine the speed at which such development progresses as well as its endpoint. The second claim has a strong overlap with the theory of grammaticalization explained in Chapter 2.
In many ways, Mühlhäusler and Harré’s arguments correlate with Wales’s, in spite of the former dealing with multiple languages and the latter a single one. What their investigations show is that there is a high degree of assumption and uncritical acceptance of traditionalists’ approaches and definitions of pronouns, and that these have to be challenged and investigated with a more empirical frame of mind. The methods of corpus linguistics offer a vital tool to achieve this and latest developments of pronoun studies in this disciplinary area will be shown in the following section.

3.5 Corpus studies

Corpus-based investigation of the Japanese language is a new and expanding area of study, starting from Kokuritsu kokugo kenkyūsho’s (National Japanese Language Institute, Kokken hereafter) study of computerized corpus of newspaper articles in 1970. Since then, there have been a number of database compilation projects lead by the same institution, starting from Fujinzasshino yōgochōsa (Studies of terms used in woman’s magazines, 1953), followed by studies of terms in 90 magazines (1962-4), high school textbooks (1983-7), television broadcasting (1995-9) and Taiyō (The Sun magazine, 2002). These projects are mainly aimed at vocabulary and terminology research and better treated as a database for more extended and specialized investigations. Other institutions and commercial firms have also created a number of corpora available on CD-ROM. In addition to these, there are some free online collections such as Aozora bunko (Aozora Collection) and J-Texts. Some of the above are available with key word search software; in other cases it is necessary to use other search tools. Appendix B lists the details of these.

Due to technological advances, a large volume of corpus-based research has been produced in the last decade; Tanomura’s research on negative forms of predicates (1994), Yokoyama’s investigation of kanji frequencies in newspapers (1998), Miyata’s research on child acquisition of Japanese language (2000), Ishii’s (2001) study on frequently used terms on television, to name a few.
Although the areas of research are diverse, studies on personal pronouns are surprisingly few. Part of Jung Hyeseon’s (2003) Socio-linguistic Study of Japanese Personal Pronouns is devoted to a corpus-based analysis of first and second person pronouns, using Shinchō bunko’s CD-ROMs. Her chronological study illustrates the changing preference for particular pronouns. For instance, use of the 2PPs, omae and anta show a steady increase at the expense of anata and kimi over the past century. However, some of her figures are not entirely reliable because of her dependence on CD-ROMs alone as source texts. For example, the kanji for ‘I’, 私, can be read as ‘watashi’, ‘atashi’, ‘watakushi’ or ‘atakushi’, depending on the speaker or the author’s intention. In her frequency count, she found 572 watashi but no watakushi in Soseki’s Kokoro (The Heart, 1914). Consulting the reproduction of the 1914 publication of Kokoro (a hard copy), it turned out that most tokens of 私 are annotated as watakushi. The CD-ROM version does not have annotation for this term and since watakushi is rarely used now, she must have automatically assumed 私 as watashi. This is one of the traps of using a corpus without referring to the original, especially in languages like Japanese that allows multiple readings and forms of a kanji. It is important to know which version the CD-ROM or online text is based on, whether the writing is converted to modernized style and if it has annotations or not, when using a corpus.

Similarly, Koike’s (1994) research on the 3PP in Soseki’s novels has some weaknesses. Using Soseki’s novels, he compares the frequencies of kare and kanojo with common nouns otoko (a man) and onna (a woman), and noticed that as the frequencies of the former increase those of the latter decrease. He concludes that in Soseki’s early novels, otoko and onna are used as 3PP substitutes until kare and kanojo established themselves as the 3PPs of choice. However, a close look at his figures reveals that he did not differentiate the normal use of these common nouns as ‘a biological or physical man/woman’ from the pronominal use, resulting in much higher frequencies of the latter. This is another trap one has to be aware of when using a key word search. Figures retrieved from a corpus do not elucidate semantic and grammatical differences, which can only be achieved through qualitative analysis.
By comparison, there are many more corpus-based studies on personal pronouns in English. Although Japanese and English personal pronouns are not the same and often function differently, corpus studies in English have a longer history and form a well-established discipline, and therefore could give insights into methodology and interpretation of data.

Among them, Busse’s thorough investigation of second person pronouns in the Shakespeare corpus (2002) stands out. By using the entire body of Shakespeare’s work, he incorporates many different approaches of earlier and shorter research into his own in order to give a comprehensive and empirical description and explanation of pronoun use in Early Modern English. Busse applies a number of theories such as Brown and Gilman’s concept of power and solidarity semantics (1978) and politeness theory (1989), markedness theory and variationist theory, as well as historical and pragmatic approaches. However, his work has been criticized for its peculiar lack of reference to later theoretical movements such as grammaticalization (e.g. Traugott and Dasher 2002, Bybee and Scheibman 1999, Haiman 1998 and Hopper 1991) that are also relevant to his research (Smith 2003).

Busse not only gives us an improved knowledge of Shakespeare’s language but also places it in the context of the history of English by comparing his findings to other Early Modern English corpora. Although his work focuses on the second person pronouns, his methods, historical approach and analytical skills of numerous data are extremely useful and adapted for my own study of Japanese 3PPs, with some modification.

3.6 Conclusion

This chapter started with a question, “why have the kare 3PPs been excluded from grammatical research?” It found the preoccupation of grammarians and linguists to be honorifics and discourse situations where 1PPs and 2PPs are the main players. The kare
3PPs, on the other hand, seem to be part of a system that does not quite fit with the definitions and strong honorific overtones of the other personal pronouns. Their nuance of foreignness, often associated with translation, also deterred many scholars from viewing the *kare* 3PPs in the same group as the other sets of personal pronouns.

Understandably, all the disciplinary areas of research, which predominantly deal with the *kare* 3PPs are concerned with contact situations; the historical linguistics of contact with Chinese, Dutch and English, and translation studies. Scholars in these fields agree that the *kare* 3PPs have somehow been associated with language contact, but have failed to appreciate the intricate process of the shift from the influence of Chinese, stretching over many centuries up until the end of the Edo period, to that of English in the Meiji period.

Those who have had most insight into the transitional process come, not from the linguistic disciplines, but from literary studies. Their analyses of changing styles of narrative in these periods have identified the oral tradition of Edo fiction, which separated narrative from the dialogue in style; dialogue was often written in a colloquial and narrative in a formal style. They also recognized the importance of *kanbun kundoku* as a means of translation, although the majority of Japanese did not interpret it as translation (they thought *kanbun kundoku* was Japanese writing). In fact, the increased use of the *kare* 3PPs coincided with the process in which this mediatory system, neither Japanese nor Chinese, was being displaced by the onset of a new colloquial writing motivated by Western influence in the Meiji period. This suggests the involvement of multiple languages in the shift of the *kare* 3PPs from more marked and infrequent to more widespread and preferred forms of third person reference. Soseki’s presence in this transitional period is identified as crucial by many of these scholars as someone who was in the right place at the right time with the right combination of personal and educational backgrounds.

Although these scholars present collectively a general picture of the change and informed speculation on how changes occurred, more often than not their observations are not supported with empirical data, and can be subjective. Data from corpus studies can give
the subjective arguments of literary commentators a valuable source of reliable information; conversely, literary investigations could supply corpus studies with theoretical explanations for the patterns of change indicated by figures. Furthermore, in all of the above disciplines there is hardly any reference to research written on/in languages other than Japanese by Japanese scholars, unless it has been translated into Japanese. Although the results of these studies may not be directly transferable to studies of Japanese, the methodologies and tools they use can be extremely useful.

One of the main intentions of this thesis is to identify and analyse these missing connections and suggest how these various fields of study might be brought together for the investigation of pronoun change in Japanese, with particular reference to novels written in the Meiji and Taishō periods. This study might then serve as a model for investigation of other aspects of change or of different historical periods.
Chapter 4

The tale of the two London shōsoku – 1901 and 1915

The first encounter of the Japanese language with the third person occurred in the Meiji period. This does not mean that the concept of third person was born at that very moment. It should be understood that the Japanese realized that the third person could be morphologically expressed and that had not been the case in Japanese.

(Noguchi Takehiko. 1994: 191)

4.1 Introduction

In 1901 while in London, Soseki was requested by his friend, Masaoka Shiki, to write something about his London adventures for a haiku journal, Hototogisu (Bush Warbler). Soseki responded with an essay, London shōsoku (Letters from London, LON1, hereafter). It was one of his earliest literary creations written in a modern colloquial style. Fifteen years later, as an accomplished writer, Soseki rewrote the essay (we call this version LON2) to be included in a new collection of his short stories. According to Komiya Toyotaka (1967: 858), one of his devoted students, Soseki never made any changes to his work once completed, with London shōsoku being the only exception. These two versions of London shōsoku present an interesting contrast, especially in the use of pronouns and narrative tense.

The aims of this chapter are: first, to find out what exactly changed in Soseki’s writing during the fifteen years that separate the two versions of London shōsoku which mark the beginning and near end of Soseki’s career (Soseki’s death came a year after LON2); second, to outline the connection between the changes made in LON2 and the mainstream linguistic shift of the time by comparing the former with the pronoun use of Soseki’s contemporaries; third, to trace the connection between the past tense and use of third person pronoun in literary writing as hypothesised by Noguchi (1994), Komori
(1988), Barthes (1953) and some others. The latter has never been given credible data to support it.

Methods of corpus linguistics are employed here as a tool to statistically compile data. Then historical and comparative methods are applied for the detailed analysis of LON1 and LON2 to investigate the pronoun change, and for the comparison of these essays with other works of Soseki. The focus of this Chapter is strictly on the beginning (1901) and the end (1915), but not the middle: in other words, what changed, and not the process of change, is the main question of this chapter. The results lead inevitably to further questions: namely, why and how did the changes take place. It is my intention to give some answers to these questions in the chapters that follow.

For the corpus analysis, the text of LON2 was downloaded from the online collection, Aozora bunko. LON1 is not available in an electronic format: it was therefore scanned from Soseki zenshū Vol. 12 (Iwanami shoten 1967) and converted to word format using the OCR software. After errors and modernized writing were corrected, the texts were arranged sentence by the sentence as parallel texts and some adjustments made so that they aligned. Then using the search command, particular words or phrases, in this case, personal pronouns, were retrieved and displayed on the computer screen.

4.2 Preliminary investigation

4.2.1 Summary and Structure of London shōsoku

LON1 consists of three chapters. In Chapter 1, Soseki explains why and how he was writing the essay, and presents a number of his critiques on various issues. Chapter 2 describes his struggles to survive in London with a modest allowance from the Japanese Government, his experiences of racial prejudice, and a story of his landlady and her family. Chapter 3 continues the tragicomic story of the family who were forced to give up their residence because of unpaid rents and of how Soseki was reluctantly drawn to their problems. LON2 contains only the last two of these three chapters. Apart from
Soseki himself, the main protagonists are, his landlady, her husband, her sister and their maid.

Table 4-1 provides the structure of Chapters 2 & 3 of LON1 and LON2, including orthographic characters and sentences of narrative and dialogue. Chapter 1 is excluded from the comparison, since LON2 does not have any counterpart. The item ‘Others’ in Table 4-1 includes various letters and advertisements placed independently in the texts. LON1 (Chapters 2 & 3) is about 1,000 characters longer than LON2 with a higher percentage of narrative (over 90%). It has 44 more sentences. The dialogue part of LON2 has roughly 7% more characters and 12% more sentences than that of LON1, suggesting an increase in direct speech that correlates with the establishment of the use of quotation marks between 1902 and 1907 (Sugimoto 1979: 166-214). The discrepancy between the percentages of characters and sentences indicates that the average sentence length in dialogue is shorter than that in narrative in LON2. Also the increase in “Others” suggests that excerpts from other sources (letters and advertisements) that are embedded in the narrative part of LON1 are placed independently in LON2.

**Table 4-1 London shōsoku: sizes and proportions of narrative and dialogue (Chapters 2 & 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LON1</th>
<th></th>
<th>LON2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>characters</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>sentences</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1</td>
<td>5,349</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2</td>
<td>7,627</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3</td>
<td>5,541</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (2+3)</td>
<td>13,168</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
<td>12,318</td>
<td>93.54</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Letters and advertisements

4.2.2 Outline of pronoun change

Some of the main changes that are observed in LON2 are:

1. a large amount of deletion of the text (Chapter 1 & part of Chapter 2),
2. a shift in the narrative tense from the present (LON1) to the past (LON2),
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(3) an increase in direct speech, and
(4) changes in the use of personal pronouns.

Of these changes, (4) is most relevant to this study and will be further analysed with
reference to (3) in sections 4.2 – 4.4. Change (2), the shift in tense, is also examined in
relation to pronoun change with reference to Soseki’s other novels in section 4.5, for
these two are considered to be closely intertwined (Noguchi 1994: 223-266). Change
(1), the deletion of segments of the text, is more to do with social and political issues,
since the deleted parts contain a range of criticism directed to both the Japanese and the
English. Also a large part of Chapter 1 is devoted to a mundane description of Soseki’s
daily routine that may have had some attraction to the Hototogisu readers who were
personally acquainted with him and did not know much about Western customs, but
would not have been so interesting to the informed modern readers of the Taisho period
(1912-1926).

First, personal pronouns in dialogue and narrative are separately investigated in order to
find whether any difference exists in the two parts.

Dialogue
LON 1 has 24 sentences (about 6% of the text) and LON2 57 (18%) of dialogue, as
shown in Table 4-1 above. The tokens of personal pronouns in dialogue are shown in
Table 4-2. The only conspicuous feature is the almost complete absence of the 3PP,
suggesting that 3PPs may have been rarely used in conversation in Soseki’s time.
However, the sample is too small to make any conclusive claim.

<p>| Table 4-2 Personal pronouns in dialogue: LON1 (24 sentences) and LON2 (57 sentences) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1PP LON1</th>
<th>LON2</th>
<th>2PP LON1</th>
<th>LON2</th>
<th>3PP LON1</th>
<th>LON2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boku</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>anata</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>omae</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Narrative

Table 4-3 shows the tokens of personal pronouns in the narrative parts of LON1 and LON2. Unlike in the case of dialogue, there is a sufficient amount of narrative to observe some significant changes, as summarised below:

- increased frequencies of 1PPs (37%) and 3PPs (71%) in LON2,
- changes in 1PP variety – from ware(LON1) to boku (LON2), and
- the appearance of female 3PP, kanojo (she/her) in LON2.

LON2 shows a significant increase in the 1PP and 3PP frequencies in narrative text, even though it is shorter than LON1. No change is seen in the frequency of the 2PP. The 2PPs in narrative appear, in indirect speech embedded in the narrative, the figures indicate similar proportions of indirect speech in both versions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>1PP</th>
<th>2PP</th>
<th>3PP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LON1</td>
<td>LON2</td>
<td>LON1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronouns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wagahai</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wareware</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warera</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shosai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bokujishin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bokutachi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+37%</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also some changes in variety. The 1PP in LON1 are dominated by the ware type pronouns such as wagahai, wareware, warera, and waga, of which wagahai is the most frequent at 65 tokens. On the other hand, in LON2, the boku type predominates, such as boku, bokujishin, bokutachi and bokura of which boku scores the highest at 93 tokens, and no ware type pronoun is used. In the 3PP, the most noticeable change is the appearance of kanojo (she/her) in LON2 and its contribution to a dramatic frequency increase. The following sections will closely investigate these changes in narrative.
4.3 1PPs in narrative

Although the focus of this thesis is 3PPs, 1PPs are examined here to highlight the differences in readership and narrative style between the two versions of London shōsoku. This is important for an understanding of Soseki’s use of 3PPs, as will become apparent in 4.5 and 4.6.

4.3.1 Type and token change

The narrator of LON1 mostly uses wagahai as a 1PP, the only exceptions being boku and shōsei used once and twice respectively. As seen in Table 4-2, boku and watashi (watakushi included) are the only 1PPs used in dialogue, and wagahai appears exclusively in narrative. The one token of boku in narrative appears in an insertion in brackets with a casual sentence ending -ne, a common colloquial illocutionary expression. Of the two tokens of shōsei in narrative, one appears in a letter, and the other in narrative and the latter is used in the same manner as wagahai. Similarly, other 1PPs with the kanji character 我 [ware] such as wareware, warera, and waga are all used in narrative. By comparison, the narrator of LON2 uses boku instead of wagahai and all the other ware type pronouns are replaced by the boku type pronouns. In addition to the change in types, LON2 has 37% more tokens of 1PPs than LON1, in spite of its text being 8% shorter. The shift of ware to boku and its increase in frequency suggest an expanding territory for boku from the specific speech environment of male students in the early 1900s, as shown in Table 4-2, to wider speech situations as well as to the narrative domain as far as the two versions of London shōsoku are concerned, although further investigation with a larger corpus is required to support this.

4.3.2 Change in address and readership

The other possible reason for the increased tokens of 1PPs is the difference in the audience to whom the text is addressed. LON1 is addressed to a small but plural audience. It was originally written for Hototogisu, a haiku journal edited by Soseki’s friend. The circulation of the journal was small and many of the members knew him. They often gathered at a member’s house and read each other’s haiku and stories aloud.
LON1 was written with reference to this audience, and not addressed to anonymous readers. This allowed Soseki to write in a more relaxed and casual manner, a manner reflected in his use of casual sentence endings with illocutionary particles such as *sa, ne*, and *yo* and the choice of *wagahai* for the narrator. *Wagahai* was not common in the Edo vocabulary but developed through public speaking in the Meiji period (Katō 1989: 449), and therefore presupposes a visible audience; that is, speaking in front of gathered audience.

At the beginning of Chapter 1 Soseki writes,

> "I'm going to write about things that have happened since I got up this morning till this moment when I am writing this letter, in a diary style that is advertised in the *Hootogisu*... Nothing exciting... But you can get a glimpse of what I have been up to in London. You (Kimira) who know me may find it interesting" (Sentence 15–19, Chapter 1, LON1).

The pronoun *kimira* used in this excerpt is a plural form of *you (kimi)* and illustrates the plurality of the reader. By comparison, LON2 is addressed to Shiki alone, at least on the surface, as indicated in the last sentence of the essay; "I am writing this letter to cheer you [kimi] up in your sickbed". *Kimi* here is second person singular. However, Shiki died in 1902 before Soseki returned from London. It seems odd to change the addressee of the letter from the *Hootogisu* members (plural) to Shiki (singular), when the latter had been dead for 13 years. This is more to do with the purpose of writing. LON1 was written to be read aloud in a small circle but LON2 seeks a wider anonymous readership and is written to be read silently (cf. Maeda 1973). This is achieved by establishing a singular addressee. In other words, each reader feels that the essay is addressed to him/her as well as to Shiki. When addressing unseen readers, *wagahai* is no longer valid, since it is primarily a pronoun used in a speech environment.

Soseki's first novel, *Wagahai wa nekodear u (I Am a Cat*, 1905. NEKO, hereafter) was also written in a similar circumstance to LON1 and the uses of the 1PP in these two

---

1 Masaoka Shiki encouraged the *Hootogisu* readers to write diaries in *shasei* style that is roughly described as a realistic writing style and an equivalent of life drawing in visual art.

2 Maeda Ai explored the changing nature of readership and the way people read in the Meiji period.
works are remarkably similar\(^3\). In NEKO, wagahai is predominantly used in narrative (468 tokens in narrative and 9 in dialogue), while boku is always in dialogue as in LON1. This reflects two things: firstly, that NEKO has strong characteristics of oral-intoned writing; and secondly, that boku was not suitable for narrative, at least in 1905.

Fujii (1993: 111) explains the first point above as Soseki’s reaction to the new expression of subjectivity exercised by Japanese Naturalist writers and his effort to “defamiliarize it by employing an orational style – a hybrid language inscribed with conventions of orality and scripted form – intoned by a household cat”. Although, he employed an orational style, he distanced himself from the speaking subject by installing a cat as a narrator. In other words, Soseki was aware of the limitations of Edo literature but was equally sceptical of the “universality” of the literature of his European contemporaries (Karatani 1993: 12).

The second point above – the unsuitability of boku in narrative writing –, boku was a new pronoun (Suzuki 1973: 141, Miura 1956: 146) commonly used in the speech of male students in the Meiji period. There is a scene in NEKO that supports this. The narrator, Neko (Cat, who has no name), follows his master to a bathhouse, listens to students’ conversation and describes them as “impertinent big mouths calling each other boku (I) and kimi (you)” (NEKO 1979[1905]: 247). Similarly, Tsubouchi Shōyō’s Tōsei shosei katagi (The Way of Present-day Students, 1885) is full of these pronouns in students’ dialogue. This kind of limited speech environment within a peer circle of students may have prevented boku from being used in a narrative that required a degree of neutrality. In fact, boku does not appear in the narrative part of Soseki’s novels until Higansugimade (After the Equinox, 1912). However, as LON2 indicates, it was fully incorporated in narrative by 1915.

\(^3\) The editor of Hototogisu, Takahama Kyoshi, actually read the first chapter of NEKO aloud with full intonation and gestures in front of the members of the journal, who gathered in his house, and it received strong applause. Also, this chapter was initially written as a one-off sketch and not for serialisation (Iio 1979: 489-491).
In summary, the 1PP shift from ware in LON1 to boku in LON2 is achieved by virtue of the widening use of boku from dialogue to narrative. Some of the motivating factors are changes in the addressee of the essay (from a small circle of friends to anonymous individuals), in readership (from Hototogisu readers to the wider readership of the Asahi newspaper), and in writing style (from oral-intoned in-group language to more neutral narrative writing).

4.4 3PPs in narrative

4.4.1 Female 3PP

Perhaps the most significant change in Soseki’s pronoun use is the appearance of the female 3PP, kanojo (she/her) in LON2. Only kare (used for both genders) and karera (a plural form of kare) appear in LON1. Table 4-4 shows the distributions of these in LON1 and LON2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>3PP total</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kanojo (F)</th>
<th>karera (pl.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sing.</td>
<td>Pl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LON1</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LON2</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: male, F: female.

Several examples of the use of kare, kanojo and karera are shown below. In LON1 kare was used for both male and female singular reference (Examples 1 & 2), and the female referents outnumber the male, due to the larger number of female characters in the essay. Kare in Example 1 refers to the landlord and kare in Example 2 to a maid called Penn, demonstrating no gender distinction in this pronoun. The plural karera refers only to female (Example 4) and male/female combination (Example 5). There is no token of karera referring to male plural. This is because the family Soseki describes – the family of his landlord - consisted of husband and wife, and the wife’s sister. In LON2, on the other hand, all tokens of kare refer to male and kanojo to female (Example 3). Examples 2 and 3 are identical sentences that mean, “The maid, Penn, is asthmatic”. However, in LON2 (Example 3) kanojo is used, instead of kare in LON1 (Example 2), showing a
clear gender distinction. At this stage, however, *kanojo* in LON2 is not restricted to single reference only, but also includes plural reference as shown in Example 6, which refers to the landlady and her sister.

1 彼は頑なで節大なるシマリのない顔をして居る。(LON1, p. 31)
  *Kare* wa sukoburu bōdainen no na i kao o shiteiru. (Husband)
  *(He has a very big, solemnly face.)*

2 彼は喘息持である (LON1, p. 27)
  *Kare* wa zensokumochi dearu. (Maid Penn)
  *(She is asthmatic.)*

3 彼女は喘息持である。 (LON2, p. 45)
  *Kanojo* wa zensokumochi dearu. (Maid Penn)
  *(She is asthmatic.)*

4 彼等は固より不正な人間ではない。 (LON1, p. 21)
  *Karera* wa motoyori fuseina ningen dewa nai. (Sisters)
  *(They are, by no means, evil people.)*

5 昨夜彼等が新宅から帰って家へ返入る途端... (LON1, p. 30)
  Sakuya *karera* ga shintaku kara kaette ie-e hairu totan... (Landlord and his wife)
  *(Last night, as they got home from their new residence...)*

6 彼女姉妹の家財は未だ其借越の家貨の代りに奪われるのが... (LON2, p. 49)
  *Kanojo* shimai no zaishan wa sōban sono karikoshi no yachin ni kawari ni ubawareru...
  (Sooner or later, *their* [they sisters + possessive particle] belongings will be taken away for the unpaid rent...)) (Sisters)

The increased frequency of the *kare* 3PPs in LON2 is mainly due to the increase of *kanojo* and its appearance seems all too sudden when compared with LON1 alone.
However, we must remember that there is a 15-year gap between the two essays and somewhere in Soseki’s writing career the breakaway of the female 3PP (kanojo) from the male 3PP (kare) must have taken place.

### 4.4.2 Comparison to other writers

How typical were Soseki’s use of *kare* for female in LON1 and of *kanojo* in LON2? To answer this question, his fellow writers’ works are investigated and compared. Table 4-5 is the list of writers who were chosen for comparison, their novels and the number of tokens of *kare* 3PPs. The texts were chosen on the basis of temporal proximity to the two essays, and are mostly from Shinchōsha’s two CD-ROMs or downloaded from an Internet collection, *Aozora bunko* (see Appendix B for details of electronic texts).
Tokens of the *kare* 3PPs were counted using a key word search function for electronic texts and counted manually for those without electronic texts. The data are by no means exhaustive, but sufficient to find a pattern in the use of the *kare* 3PPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>M. sing.</th>
<th>F. sing.</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozaki Kōyō</td>
<td>Tajō takon</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>kare 220</td>
<td>kare 32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futabatei Shimei</td>
<td>Ukigusa</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>kare 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izumi Kyōka</td>
<td>Tsuya monogatari</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>kare 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>karera 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsume Soseki</td>
<td>LON1</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>kare 2</td>
<td>kare 10</td>
<td>karera 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayama Katai</td>
<td>Jūemon no shi</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td>kare 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>karera 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Tōson</td>
<td>Hakai</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>kare 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanizaki Jun'ichiro</td>
<td>Himitsu</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanojo 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arishima Takeo</td>
<td>Aru onna (Part I)</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>kare 10</td>
<td>kanojo 16</td>
<td>karera 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Tōson</td>
<td>Sakuranomi no jukusuru toki</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>kare 266</td>
<td>kanojo 33</td>
<td>karera 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsume Soseki</td>
<td>LON2</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>kare 8</td>
<td>kanojo 20</td>
<td>karera 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Around 1900 when LON1 was written, no writer in Table 4-5 was using *kanojo*; instead, *kare* was used for both male and female – Kōyō’s *Tajō takon* (1898) has 220 tokens of male *kare* and 32 tokens of female *kare*. However, a tendency for *kare* to specialize towards male singular 3PP is detected before the actual appearance of *kanojo* – four out of six of the novels from around 1900 have only the male use of *kare*. On the other hand, in the 1910s when LON2 was written, all other writers were using *kanojo*, indicating a widely accepted use of this new 3PP. This supports the claim that the change Soseki made from *kare* to *kanojo* in LON2 was motivated not by his own preference but reflected a wider linguistic change that happened between 1901 and 1915. Further, according to Table 4-5, one could pinpoint the first appearance of *kanojo* in novels to around 1910. This will be further examined in Chapter 8.

### 4.4.3 Referents of *kare* 3PPs

There is another question that arises from the change in the use of *kare* 3PPs in *London shōsoku*; who is the referent when *kare*, *kanojo* and *karera* are used? Table 4-6 shows the distribution of these pronouns according to the referent.
Table 4-6 Referents of kare, kanojo and karera in LON1 and LON2 (raw figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kanojo</th>
<th>karera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LON1</td>
<td>LON2</td>
<td>LON1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlord</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sister</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landlady</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landlady</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Penn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *kare* 3PPs are used for four people in the essay. All belong to the family with whom Soseki was lodging: the landlord and landlady, her sister and the maid called Penn, suggesting Soseki’s use of the *kare* 3PPs is for familiar people, and not strangers, such as a debt collector and fellow lodgers. Penn is especially referred to as *kare* (in LON1) and *kanojo* (in LON2). She is the person of whom Soseki speaks most favourably amongst the people he met in London.

In summary, of the three pronouns of the *kare* type, LON1 uses just two – *kare* (singular) and *karera* (plural) – and *kare* is used for both male and female. In LON2 *kanojo* appears as female third person singular and its frequency is much higher than that of *kare*, mainly because female characters outnumber male characters in this text. Also, Soseki tends to use the *kare* 3PPs only for people close to him.

The comparison with fellow writers’ novels reveals that the pattern of pronoun use depicted in Soseki’s *London shōsoku* is not unique to Soseki. It is more widespread and *kanojo* seems to have become commonly used in narrative sometime between the years that separate LON1 and LON2, from 1910 onwards. In a sense, the two *London shōsoku* mark the beginning and the end of the *kare* 3PPs assimilation process in narrative and Soseki’s career spans this period of change.

4.5 Shift in narrative tense

4.5.1 Past tense and 3PP

Narrative tense and the 3PP are seemingly unrelated, yet in novel writing, they form a unique liaison. Roland Barthes (1953: 29-40) discusses this relationship between the simple past tense (‘the preterite’ to him), third person narrative writing and the third
person pronoun (*he*). According to Barthes, the simple past tense is "the cornerstone of Narrative" (Note: he uses a capital N for both 'Narrative' and 'Novel') and "ideal instrument for every construction of a world". Its role is "to reduce reality to a point of time", and to abstract "a slim and pure logos" "from the multiplicity of experiences". It demands events be sequentially organised for intelligibility, and is therefore a tool for linear progression.

What Barthes is saying is that the simple past tense is a tool to arrange our experience and happenings of the world, which are manifold and complex, into a simple chronological order in order to understand them. Similarly, Karatani (1994: 20) argues that the introduction of the past tense establishes a neutral and perspective viewpoint, which enables the narrator to reflect on past events and tell a story in chronological order in Japanese novel writing. This kind of writing contrasts with Edo novels, in which multiple voices, times and viewpoints, all of these coexist (Sakai 1991: 120-1).

However, Barthes is quick to add that because of its very nature of reduction and abstraction, the past tense alienates the facts. It tries to be true to the facts but can never be, since it is a mere "image of order" and its abstraction betrays the reality. "Mere image of order" in this context means that no matter how we try, the past tense cannot allow us to fully grasp reality, it can only present a small abstracted version of it. For this reason, the use of the past tense in the Novel can never be free from its self-imposed contradiction and ambiguity.

This "ambiguous function" (p. 34) of the past tense is also shared by the third person in the Novel. Barthes writes:

"The 'he' is a typical novelistic convention; like the narrative tense, it signifies and carries through the action of the Novel. (...) The third person, like the preterite, therefore performs this service for the art of the Novel, and supplies its consumers with the security born of a credible fabrication which is yet constantly held up as false" (Barthes 1953: 35-7).

Barthes likens the ambiguous function of the 3PP, described as "a credible fabrication", to a mask that Western novels have to wear so that the author can distance himself from
the protagonist. It is "credible" because we believe that the narrator is invisible but it is, after all, "a fabrication" because he/she can never be invisible. The distance gives the third person narrative some sort of neutrality. And this is exactly what the Meiji writers were looking for in order to break away from an Edo fiction that was heavily indebted to oral tradition and had intrusive narrators/authors. The influence of Western fiction on Meiji novels is well documented (e.g. Morioka 1999, Koike 1994, Komori 1988). Meiji writers, such as Soseki and Ogai, took advantage of their knowledge of European literature and extracted certain elements of it to serve their purposes while ignoring others (Miyoshi 1989: 152). Past tense narrative writing and 3PPs are examples of these.

The following section will focus on how these two features work and reinforce each other in Soseki's writing, using LON1 and LON2 as source texts and his other novels for a comparison.

4.5.2 Distribution of non-past and past tenses

Japanese tenses are identified with sentence endings: particles (joshi), and inflection of verbs, auxiliary verbs (jodoshi), and adjectives. In modern Japanese, the non-past tense is normally identified with the dictionary forms of verbs, adjectives, auxiliary verbs. For example, owaru (finish), dekiru (can/be able to) and atsui (hot) are dictionary forms and have non-past tense meaning ( habitual or future for owaru and habitual or present for dekiru and atsui). The past tense usually ends with 'ta': owatta (finished), dekita (was able to), or atsukatta (was hot).

Following this classification, Table 4-7 shows the numbers and percentages of sentences in the non-past and past tenses in LON1 and LON2. Only 22% of LON1 is written in the past tense, while 56% of LON2 is in the past tense. The difference for the past tense between LON1 and LON2 is nearly 34%, a difference to which the use of the ta-ending (simple past) is the major contributor. These figures indicate not only the increased use of the past tense in narrative but also the overwhelming dominance of the ta-ending for the past tense and in particular, in narrative: more than one in two sentences end in ta in LON2. This clearly demonstrates an expanding use of the ta-ending in Soseki's writing.
Table 4-7 Distribution of present and past tenses in narrative of LON1 and LON2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending types</th>
<th>LON1 sentences</th>
<th>LON2 sentences</th>
<th>Differences (%) LON2-LON1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various types</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>+33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ta</em></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>+28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The question arising from the increased presence of the *ta*-ending is at what expense *ta* achieved its dominance. Further investigation of individual varieties of sentence endings is carried out to answer this.

Table 4-8 Types and tokens of sentence endings in LON1 and LON2 (raw figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ending types</th>
<th>LON1</th>
<th>LON2</th>
<th>Difference (%) LON2 - LON1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-past</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>u</em> + consonant + <em>u</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative (<em>not</em>) <em>nu</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>-13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>i</em> + <em>shii</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjectives</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative (<em>not</em>) <em>nai</em></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| copula/
   *no* + copula |      |      |                           |
| *da*         | 45   | 1    | -12.9                     |
| *noda*       | 6    | 2    | -1.0                      |
| *dearu*      | 19   | 16   | +0.7                      |
| *nodearu*    | 9    | 8    | +0.5                      |
| others       |      |      |                           |
| auxil. verbs
   (jōdōshi) | 9    | 6    | -0.3                      |
| particles (*shōjōshi*) | 11   | 3    | -2.0                      |
| noun ending  | 4    | 1    | -1.2                      |
| -*te*        | 1    | 1    | +0.1                      |
| Past         |      |      |                           |
| Subtotal     | 75   | 141  | +33.9                     |
| simple past  |      |      |                           |
| *teita*      | 70   | 124  | +28.6                     |
| other past   |      |      |                           |
| *ta* + *noda* |      |      |                           |
| 2             | 11   | 4.4  | +4.4                      |
| *ta* + *nodearu* | 2     | 0.4  | +5.3                      |
| Total        | 339  | 252  |                           |

Table 4-8 shows the detailed distribution of ending types in the narrative parts of LON1 and LON2. The non-past tense is divided into four categories according to the sentence endings: ending in *u* or ‘consonant + *u*’ (verbs and negative *nu*); ending in *i* or *shii* (adjectives and negative *nai*); ending in *da*, *noda*, *dearu* and *nodearu* (copula and ‘*no* +
copula’); and ‘others’, which include a variety of auxiliary verbs \( jōdōshi \), particles for sentence ending \( shūjōshi \), noun endings, and the \(-te\) form (a conjunctive particle) ending – a kind of unfinished sentence. The past tense is divided in two – the simple past (the \( ta\)-ending) and other past (\( teita\) – past continuous and ‘\( ta + nodai/nodearu\)’, which expresses a subjective statement of past events/action).

The most frequent type of sentence ending in LON1 is the present form of verbs at 88 tokens, followed by the \( ta\)-ending at 70, then the copular auxiliary verb \( da\) at 45 and the present form of adjectives at 33. Together with the negative auxiliary verb, \( nai\) (31 tokens), the four most frequent non-past tense endings account for 197 tokens and 58% of the total. By comparison, the most frequent sentence ending type in LON2 is the \( ta\)-ending at 124 tokens that accounts for 49% of the total. All four categories of the non-past forms show varying degrees of decrease, totalling minus 34%, which directly relates to the increase of the \( ta\)-ending. Although the past continuous form, \( teita\), appears only in LON2 (11 tokens), the majority of the past tense is dominated by the \( ta\)-ending (88% of the past tense total). Both non-past verbs and the \( da\) ending show large decreases and noun endings have disappeared in LON 2, while only the negative, \( nai\), shows a recognizable increase (2.4%). However, this increase could reflect the result of the disappearance of another negative form, \( nu\), which is more archaic and was becoming infrequent in a modern colloquial writing, rather than increased use of the negative ending itself.

What these figures signify is not only a shift from the non-past to past tense, but also (and more importantly), the increase of one particular form, the \( ta\)-ending at the expense of several other ending forms. Verbs, adjectives and auxiliary verbs have different endings in the non-past tense, but they all end in \( ta\) in the simple past tense. This means that the variety of sentence endings that are present in LON1 is largely lost in LON2,

---

4 \( jōdōshi\) are inflected dependent forms used at the ends of sentences, and suffixed to nouns, verbs and adjectives, to express various functions (e.g. passive, desirative, speculation).

5 \( shūjōshi\) are noninflected dependant final particles used normally at the ends of sentences, and suffixed to nouns, verbs and adjectives, to express a speaker’s/writer’s feelings (e.g. interrogative, illocation, objection).
and that the narrative written in the simple past tense has more uniform sentence endings than the one written in the non-past tense.

4.5.3 The *ta*-ending

Sentence endings in LON2 are fewer in variety and the main contributor is the past tense, the *ta*-ending. But how does this relate to pronoun increase? Representations of the past tense in Japanese have not always been restricted in variety. According to Noguchi (1980: 147), in the Heian period (794–1192) there were six past tense forms: *ki*, *keri*, *tsu*, *nu*, *tari*, and *ri*, all inflected dependant⁶ forms, and each implied a degree of the speaker’s involvement in the event described in the sentence. The variety decreased with time and in the Kamakura period (1192–1333) these ending forms were often dropped where there was another sentence element that indicated the past (e.g. ‘long time ago’ or ‘last year’) (Kindaichi 1988: 87). By the Edo period (1603–1867), *ta* was the only auxiliary verb for the past tense commonly used in speech (Yuzawa 1964, quoted in Noguchi 1994: 237). In writing, however, old forms were still used, as the style of writing was often formal.

A detailed account of the transformation of this colloquial *ta* into the main narrative ending in writing is well documented in Noguchi’s *Sanninshō no hakkenmade (The Discovery of Third Person*, 1994). The essence of his argument is that by introducing the *ta*-ending to narrative writing, Meiji fiction was able to neutralise the narrator’s presence. This was previously impossible to do because of the nature of the Japanese language as well as the strong story-telling aspect of Japanese fiction.⁷ Japanese sentence endings not only indicate the tense but also carry various functions and meanings, such as the negative, passive, desiderative, etc. They also indicate the relationship between the speaker and the addressee, the speaker and the referent as well as the addressee and the referent. In other words, the sentence ending obligatorily reveals the speaker’s

⁶ ‘Dependent’ means that the term is always attached to something else and never used on its own.
⁷ Stories are often told as if they were happening right in front of the narrator who is also present in the story and sometimes quite interfering. Eavesdropping is a technique favoured by many Edo writers, since it gives the narrator an opportunity to witness the event that he/she has to tell to the reader (Noguchi 1994: 81). This tendency was carried over into early to mid-Meiji fiction of which LON1 is an example.
standpoint regardless of the writer's intention. For instance, Ogai (1890) was critical of colloquial endings for their vulgar connotation. This is an obstacle when the writer wants the narrator to keep a neutral position, as is the case in a third person narrative novel. The introduction of the simple past marker, the *ta*-ending, to narrative helped Meiji writers to introduce a new objective narrator into their novels and tell a story as a recollection of past events, rather than the real-life reporting used in Edo fiction. Futabatei Shimei is credited as one of the first writers to effectively use this form (Noguchi 1994, Komori 1988). Parts II & III of his three-part first novel, *Ukigumo (The Drifting Clouds)*, 1887), are experiments of a third person narrative style and the past tense, while Part I retains many characteristics of Edo fiction and are mostly written in the non-past tense.

4.6 Sentence endings and personal pronouns

4.6.1 Relationship of past tense and 3PP

So far the adoption of the simple past tense (the *ta*-ending) in narrative fulfilled the goal of the modern narrative, neutrality, through reduction and abstraction as described by Barthes. However it was not without consequences. Unlike French and English that require the 3PP to stand for nouns by convention, the Japanese language did not (and still does not) commonly use the 3PP overtly. For instance, in the *Tale of the Genji* (1021), a Japanese classic novel, the person is identifiable from the sentence endings and honorifics, and in Edo fiction the narrator was often present in the story with the relationship of various characters understood through the voice of the first person narrator. With the introduction of the *ta*-ending into narrative, the narrator in Meiji novels became almost invisible and the person less marked. Neutrality, by its very nature, obscured the identity of the speaker, listener and the referent: it became less easy to identify them with the sentence ending. This is where the connection between sentence ending and personal pronoun comes into play. An obvious solution to overcome the ambiguity of the person was to insert personal pronouns for key referents; and this is exactly what happened at the turn of the 20th century when the two *London shōsoku* were written.
If the *ta*-ending is related to the increased use of personal pronouns (especially of 3PPs), and to third person narrative writing, then it is expected that 3PPs and the *ta*-ending would be most frequent in third person narrative novels, and less frequent in first person novels and essays where the narrator has a presence in the story. This will be explored in the following section.

### 4.6.2 Corpus analysis of past tense and 3PP

In order to test the above hypothesis, Soseki's works were grouped according to genres, and the frequencies of 3PPs counted using the CD-ROM *Shinchō bunko no Meiji no bungō* (1996) that contains all major works of Soseki. For the sentence ending count, data from Kumakura's *Nihongoniyou tori bunkajōshōshorinitsuite* (*A Corpus-based Analysis of Japanese Literary Texts*, 1997) is used.

First, Soseki's essays are examined. Table 4-9 shows the frequencies of the *ta*-ending and 3PPs in his selected essays and short stories arranged chronologically. LON1 and LON2 are Soseki's first and last essays.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4-9 Ta-ending and 3PPs in Soseki's essays</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LON1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nihyaku toka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunchō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eijitsu shōhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omoidsasu koto dado*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garasudono uchi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LON2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table based on Kumakura 1997: 13, my 3PP count added. * My count.)

The *ta*-ending shows an increase of over 30% between *Nihyaku toka* (*210th Day*) and *Bunchō* (*A Java Sparrow*), from 24.78% to 56.96%. After that it does not show much increase and maintains more or less a similar frequency, although *Garasudo no uchi* (*Inside of the Glass Door*) shows a slightly higher count. The 3PP frequency is very low in most essays on the list and stays at between two to six tokens per 100 sentences. By
comparison, the last essay, LON2, shows a much higher 3PP frequency with nearly 18 tokens per 100 sentences. Even *Garasudo no uchi*, which was written immediately before LON2, has only one third of that of LON2’s 3PP count.

First person narrative novels are the next to be investigated. Table 4-10 shows the *ta-*ending and 3PPs in Soseki’s first person narrative novels also arranged chronologically. The earlier novels show some erratic changes in both the *ta-*ending and 3PP distributions. The last two novels have much higher frequencies of the *ta-*ending at 87.21% and 73.32% in that order. However, their pronoun counts do not seem to show parallel changes to the *ta-*ending counts: KOJI has a high frequency of 3PPs but KOKO’s 3PP count is much lower in relation to the rate of the *ta-*ending. Therefore it is difficult to conclude that the increased use of the *ta-*ending in first person narrative is related to the increased frequency of 3PPs in Soseki’s first person narrative novels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sentences raw figures</th>
<th><em>ta</em> raw figures</th>
<th>% of <em>ta</em></th>
<th>3PP</th>
<th>3PP/100 sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEKO 1905</td>
<td>4863</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTC 1906</td>
<td>2181</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA 1906</td>
<td>2112</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFU 1908</td>
<td>3715</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>41.61</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOJI 1912</td>
<td>5161</td>
<td>4501</td>
<td>87.21</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>19.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOKO 1914</td>
<td>4246</td>
<td>2988</td>
<td>73.32</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>8.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table based on Kumakura 1997: 13, my 3PP count added.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sentences raw figures</th>
<th><em>ta</em> raw figures</th>
<th>% of <em>ta</em></th>
<th>3PP</th>
<th>3PP/100 sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GUBI 1908</td>
<td>4645</td>
<td>1033</td>
<td>22.23</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN 1909</td>
<td>4936</td>
<td>2442</td>
<td>49.47</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE 1910</td>
<td>4468</td>
<td>3686</td>
<td>82.49</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>8.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON 1911</td>
<td>3087</td>
<td>2815</td>
<td>91.18</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA 8 1912</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>87.54</td>
<td>862</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHI 1915</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>3280</td>
<td>97.67</td>
<td>1672</td>
<td>49.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI 1916</td>
<td>6199</td>
<td>5991</td>
<td>96.64</td>
<td>2630</td>
<td>42.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table based on Kumakura 1997: 13, my 3PP count added.)

---

8 *Higansugimade* (HIGA) is written part as the first and part as the third person narrative style. The figures on the table show only the part written as the third person narrative.
Finally, third person narrative novels are examined. Table 4-11 shows the ta-ending and 3PPs in Soseki’s third person narrative novels. The ta-ending shows an increase in frequency with time and reaches nearly 98% in MICH and 97% in MEI. However, the rate of increase is not steady: there are sharp increase from GUBI to SAN and from SAN to SORE, amounting 27 % and 33% respectively; after SORE the percentages of ta-ending are consistently high ranging between 82% and 98%. 3PPs also show an increase from just over one (per 100 sentences) in GUBI to almost 50 in MICH and 42 in MEI. Again, the rate of increase demonstrates a quantum leap from about 2 in SAN to over 8 in SORE – a four fold increase which correlates with the sharp increase of the ta-ending between the two novels – and further leaps between MON (11) and HIGA (25) and between HIGA (25), and MICH (50) (two fold increases).

These figures are much higher than those in the first person narrative novels as shown in Table 4-10. However, the growth rate of ta in the third person novels does not always parallel that of the 3PPs. The percentages of ta show in Table 4-11 have already reached over 80% by the third novel (SORE), meaning that there is only a small amount of room for any further growth in the next four novels, and the percentages at this stage practically plateau. Those of the 3PP in SORE are still relatively small and have still not increased much by the fourth novels (MON). It is only in the last two novels on the table that the percentages of the 3PPs seem to reach a plateau. This indicates that the adoption of the past tense took place earlier than the frequent use of the 3PPs in Soseki’s novels. This is understandable, for if the increased use of ta is the cause of the 3PP increase, we would expect the effect to take place sometime later. These three novels will be further examined in Chapter 7 (7.4.3).

As mentioned in section 4.5.3 of this chapter, the first modern Japanese colloquial novel, Futabatei Shimei’s Ukigumo (1887), shows the progression from the Edo style narrative writing in the non-past tense with frequent use of noun endings and the te (a conjunctive particle) ending in Part I, to a new modern narrative writing in the past tense with the experimental use of the ta-ending in Parts II & III (for more details, see 6.4.1). However, 3PPs hardly feature in Ukigumo, even in these last two Parts. There is no token of the
kare 3PP: instead, are, which was a frequent feature in Edo colloquial fiction, is used for third person human reference. Similarly, Soseki’s LON1, which is mostly written in the non-past tense, also features noun endings (4 tokens), the te ending (1) and an old negative term, nu (8), although in small numbers (see Table 4-8 above). These particular ending types are all absent from LON2, which, instead, includes extensive use of the ta-ending and increased tokens of the kare 3PPs. These two examples (the narrative shifts in Ukigumo and in the two versions of London shōsoku) support that the shift from the non-past tense to the past tense preceded the increased use of 3PPs, especially the kare type, in narrative.

Tables 4-9, 4-10 and 4-11, together show an increase of the ta-ending in all three genres – essays, first person narrative novels and third person narrative novels – of Soseki’s writing. But the rates of increase differ: third person narrative novels show the most dramatic increase, followed by first person narrative novels and essays in that order. In the case of the 3PP, only third person narrative novels show a steady increase that almost parallels that of the ta-ending. This supports the hypothesis that increase of the ta-ending generated increase of the 3PPs, in particular, in third person narrative novels, as far as Soseki’s novels are concerned.

4.7 Conclusion

The investigation of the two versions of London shōsoku, LON1 (1901) and LON2 (1915), revealed several changes in Soseki’s writing:

(1) a significant increase in tokens of personal pronouns in narrative, while that in dialogue remains relatively unchanged. There are changes in 1PPs and 3PPs in both type and frequency but no change in the second person in narrative.

(2) a shift from the ware-type to boku-type in first person that illustrates the widening territory of boku at the expense of ware and is motivated by changes in addressee, readership and the nature of writing.
(3) the appearance of kanojo (she/her) in the narrative part of LON2. A similar change is seen in other writers’ works that indicates its widespread use.

(4) an increase of past tense endings, with a dominance of the ta-ending. This is most pronounced in third person narrative novels that also display higher frequencies of the 3PP.

Linguistically, the change in the 3PP and shift from the present tense to the past tense in narrative are the most significant features. Detailed analysis of these revealed that the two are closely related. Many of the revisions in LON2 are not necessarily a reflection of Soseki’s personal style but more to do with adjustment to the wider linguistic and social change of the period. Changes in readership, the nature of narrator, and the establishment of modern third person narrative writing as the main literary style were some of the contributing factors.

By looking at the two London shōsoku, we have been able to identify a number of changes in Soseki’s writing between 1901 and 1915, and the comparison with his contemporaries suggests that the changes in pronoun use are not personal but historical. However, the question of how the changes took place remains unanswered. The following chapters will focus on the process of pronoun change and attempt to identify the mechanism of change through both quantitative and qualitative investigations of 3PPs.
Chapter 5

Personal pronouns in Soseki’s thirteen novels

5.1 Introduction

This chapter sets out to investigate the emergence of the 3PPs, *kare* (he), *kanojo* (she) and *karera* (they) in Soseki’s novels in connection with narrative types and other terms of reference such as personal names and common nouns. The chapter starts with a brief overview of the literary context in which Soseki operated, stressing the enormous changes that were underway at the time. The methodology adopted in the present study is described in section 5.2, and data on the distribution of personal pronouns in Soseki’s work are presented. This data is discussed in detail in section 5.3, and concluding remarks follow in section 5.4.

5.2 Literary context: the late Edo and Meiji periods

The Meiji period in which Soseki wrote was an era of tremendous upheaval in Japan. But language change does not happen overnight. Any shift usually takes a long time and the process is complex, with many factors involved. Explaining a few important factors about the pre-Meiji (Edo) literary world in Japan will help to set the scene for the analysis of Soseki’s texts. These factors include:

- the emerging distinction between the second and third persons within the non-first person domain,
- the oral tradition and dominance of first person narrative prose, and
- the separation of dialogue and narrative in literary genres.

Each one of these factors, plus Western influence in the Meiji period will be examined in detail in the following sub-sections.
5.2.1 Emergence of 3PP

The history of the word *kare* is well documented. Okumura (1954), Yanagida (1966), Yanabu (1995) and Hida (2002), to name a few, have written on various aspects of *kare*. The most thorough and comprehensive research is Li’s *Nihongo shiji taikei no rekishi* (*History of Japanese Demonstratives*) (2002). Li investigates diachronic change in the use of *kare* from the earliest literary text, *Kojiki* (701), to late Edo (19th century) literature. Although his main focus is demonstratives, he illustrates the shift of *kare* from demonstrative to personal pronoun very well.

According to Li, *kare* was used in the Heian period (794-1192) for the Japanese annotation (*kun*) of the Chinese character 彼. It was originally used as a demonstrative but turned into a non-first person pronoun. Therefore *kare* often appears in Chinese-style writing, especially in translated Buddhist texts (p. 393). *Kare* also appears in the *Isoho monogatari*, a 17th-century Japanese translation of *Aesop’s Fables* by Portuguese missionaries. In Edo (1603-1868) literary texts, *kare* appears regularly in *yomihon* (a genre of narrative prose fiction), translations of *baihua* (Chinese colloquial fiction), and Chinese-style comic stories. In translations of *baihua*, *kare* is mostly used in dialogue as a translation of the Chinese 彼 (*he/she*). For translators in Nagasaki the use of *kare* was customary in their translation of 3PPs from Dutch texts. Throughout the Edo period, the frequency of *kare* increased slowly in Chinese-style writing. But at this point *kare* had a broad reference, including male and female, human and non-human, and singular and plural, and the use of *karera* (the plural form) was limited. Table 5-1 illustrates Li’s claim regarding the historical shift of *kare*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5-1 History of <em>kare</em> (Based on Li, 2002)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kare</em> non-first person demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kare</em> non-first person pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kare</em> general third person pronoun*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. <em>karera</em> human/non-human &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>karera</em> 3PP m. sing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanojo 3PP f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; &gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>human &gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes male/female, human/non-human, singular/plural.
Older and newer forms coexist for individual speakers as well as for communities over time. Such coexistence, what Hopper (1991) has called layering, is shown above. In short, *kare* had gone through the following changes before the Meiji period.

Non-first person demonstrative > non-first person pronoun > third person pronoun

It was in the Meiji period (1868-1912) when the specialization of *kare* — the separation of a female form *kanojo*, and the frequent use of the plural form *karera* — began. This time the influence came from English. Here, the point to note is that *kare* has always been involved in the translation of foreign texts in the history of Japanese language, starting from Chinese, moving through Portuguese, Chinese again, then Dutch and English.

5.2.2 Dominance of first person narrative

Noguchi (1994) investigated the emergence of the modern Japanese novel from the narrative point of view. His main argument is that Japanese literature did not know the third person narrative until the Meiji period. A characteristic of Edo literature was its strong oral tradition. In a popular Edo form of puppet theatre, *joruri*, for example, the chanter is situated on a raised platform and addresses the audience directly. Stories come to life only when they are vocalized by the chanter and enacted through the puppets. In this situation, writers could only express their existence through the chanter. In other *gesaku* (popular fiction) genres, stories also follow the oral tradition and the writer/narrator often shows up in the story and comments on characters and storyline, sometimes even making deviations from the standard story. As these examples show, the modern Western style third person narration with an omni-present, transparent and objective narrator did not exist in Edo literature.

5.2.3 Separation of dialogue and narrative

Another characteristic of Edo literature is the clear separation of dialogue and narrative, which is closely related to the oral tradition stated above. In *joruri*, dialogue is accompanied by a *shamisen* (three string guitar) but the narrative is not. In the genres of *kokkeibon* (comic stories) and *sharebon* (a genre of popular fiction that is concerned exclusively with life in the pleasure quarters), dialogue is so
dominant that the narrative parts are deprived of space and squeezed to a minimum. Furthermore, dialogue succeeds in capturing reality by absorbing vernacular speech, while the occasional narrative elements maintains the formal style (Noguchi 1994: 94). Inevitably, in the domain of literary writing, the writing reform that took place during the Meiji period was concerned mainly with innovation and the modernization of narrative and went hand in hand with translation. Third-person narrative writing was especially new to Japan and changed the way the writers used 3PPs.

5.2.4 Western influence
What made the literary situation of the Meiji period different from that of the previous era was the introduction of foreign language education and the large volume of Western literature in translation, resulting from direct contact with the West. In the early Meiji period, the Japanese government employed many Western teachers to educate young Japanese students. In 1872 the modern public education system was established based on an American model, and English was made a compulsory subject for students in years 1-6. This was the first time that Japanese had direct contact with native Western teachers.

Morioka’s (1999: 156-157) investigation of pronouns in English language texts translated into Japanese for government schools shows the common practice of Japanese translators of the Meiji period. Their method was the word-for-word translation style that had been used for Chinese and Dutch translation for centuries. The results of this practice are more like ‘translationese’, with little relation to natural speech. The advantage of this kind of translation, however, is that it is easier to see the sentence structure of the original text and that it is suited for teaching the grammar of the original language. In some cases every single pronoun in the original English text was translated into Japanese (Morioka 1999: 162). This inevitably contributed to the increased use of pronouns in Japanese writing.

As a result of language education, many Japanese acquired foreign language skills and began to translate Western novels and works on literary theory. Futabatei Shimei (1864-1909) attempted realistic and detailed description and psychological expression in translations of Turgenev’s short stories as well as in his own novel
Ukigumo (*The Drifting Cloud*, 1887). In the Meiji 20s (1887-1896), the “Kenyūsha” group of writers took on Classicism, and the “Bungakukai” group worshipped Romanticism under the influence of Christianity. After the Russo-Japanese War (1904), the Naturalism movement developed quickly, inspired by French writers such as Emile Zola, and many Japanese writers tried realistic expressions in their writing. But they quickly became obsessed with their own private affairs and later turned to a confessional style of writing.

These were the literary trends Soseki witnessed before he penned his first novel in 1906. Soseki did not belong to any of these groups. Instead, his novel writing started along with his academic writing, *Bungakuron (Studies on Literature)* (1907), which was based on his investigation of the 18th-19th century English literature and prepared for the lectures given at Tokyo Imperial University. Soseki (1906: 492) lists Robert Louis Stevenson as his favorite for his articulate and dynamic writing. Komori (1988a: 55) notes that a decade of Soseki’s career (1905-1916) represents “the most basic and holistic approach to novel writing” of the time. The popularity and influence of Soseki is well illustrated by his move from the university to the *Asahi shinbun (The Asahi Newspaper)*, following the successes of *Wagahai wa neko dearu (I Am a Cat*, 1905) and *Botchan (A Young Master*, 1906). This was unprecedented as was the subsequent shift of the *Asahi* readership from the predominantly merchant to the intellectual class (Koizumi 1958). In the year of Soseki’s move (1907), the *Asahi* sold more than 200,000 copies daily in Tokyo and Osaka combined (Komori 1988: 55). Thus, Soseki’s serialized novels had a large readership.

5.3 Investigation of Soseki’s writing

5.3.1 Methodology

Most of the research on Soseki is in the area of literary criticism rather than modern linguistics. Linguistic investigations of his writing are scattered, and often narrow in scope, as they usually focus on individual novels or what are loosely-terméd ‘trilogies’

\(^{1}\). This study aims to carry out an empirical study of all of Soseki’s novels.

\(^{1}\) For example, *Sanshiro* (1907), *Sorekara* (1908) and *Mon* (1909) are often referred to as Soseki’s early period trilogy; and *Higansugimade* (1911), *Kojin* (1913) and *Kokoro* (1914) as his later period trilogy.
Short stories and medium length novellas are excluded. The source of the texts is the *CD-ROM Meiji no bungō* (Iwanami shoten 1997), which contains all of Soseki’s novels in expanded book format along with key word search software. The online library, *Aozora bunko*, from which one can download most works of the early modern writers in various formats, and *Soseki zenshū (The Complete Works of Soseki)* (Iwanami shoten 1965-7) are also referred to. These are used to check the pronunciation of particular pronouns when there is a possibility of multiple pronunciations, since the CD-ROM version does not show all the annotations of Chinese characters. The source texts are shown in Table 5-2. The Character counts (length of individual novels) are based on the Aozora bunko’s online texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sigil</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Narrative type</th>
<th>Length in each novel (characters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEKO</td>
<td>Wagahai wa neko de aru</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>317,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTC</td>
<td>Botchan</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>87,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA</td>
<td>Kusamakura</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>81,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUBI</td>
<td>Gubijinso</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>196,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFU</td>
<td>Kofu</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>121,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Sanshiro</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>168,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>Sorekara</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>161,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>Mon</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>139,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>Higasugimade</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>3rd and 1st</td>
<td>168,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOJI</td>
<td>Koin</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>221,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOKO</td>
<td>Kokoro</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>138,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH</td>
<td>Michikusa</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>127,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>Meian</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>320,209</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to measure frequencies of the use of pronouns and collocations of terms that might be attributed to language change these texts were searched using the key word search function attached to the CD-ROM. The frequencies of pronouns for each person (first, second, third) and the changes in their frequencies and use over time are investigated to:

- find tendencies in the uses of individual pronouns within texts
- find distribution patterns within particular texts and compare differences between texts, and
- identify narrative patterns and significant syntactic patterns.

Qualitative methods are then applied to investigate further the detailed distributions of pronouns in reference to characters, particular situations, and age and gender, in
order to find explanations for the changes suggested by the frequency patterns. This process is achieved by manually sorting out the computer-generated tokens acquired through the quantitative method.

5.3.2 Change in frequencies of all three persons

Table 5-3 shows the tokens of personal pronouns (1PPs, 2PPs and 3PPs) and their total in Soseki’s 13 novels starting from NEKO (1905) to MEI (Meian 1916). Since the length of each novel varies, the figures on the charts are normalised to a figure of number of personal pronouns per 100,000 orthographic characters to ensure comparability, unless otherwise indicated. The titles in red are first person narrative novels and those in black are third person narrative novels. Chart 5-A is created based on the figures in Table 5-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEKO 1905</th>
<th>BOTC 1906</th>
<th>KUSA 1906</th>
<th>GUBI 1907</th>
<th>KOFU 1908</th>
<th>SAN 1908</th>
<th>SORE 1909</th>
<th>MON 1910</th>
<th>HIGA 1911</th>
<th>KOJI 1913</th>
<th>KOKO 1914</th>
<th>MICH 1915</th>
<th>MEI 1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1PP</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1744</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PP</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>880</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td>1858</td>
<td>2134</td>
<td>1421</td>
<td>1296</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 5-A Frequencies of personal pronouns in Soseki’s 13 novels (/100,000 characters)

Chart 5-A shows that, over the course of Soseki’s writing career, the total number of personal pronouns appearing in his novels is on the rise, with a few minor ups and downs, until KOKO, and then it declines. However, the rate of increase and decrease
differs in the three persons. The second person pronouns (2PPs) appear to show consistent frequency over time. The first person pronouns (1PPs) show more erratic movement. Soseki's second novel BOTC has a much higher 1PP frequency than his first novel. The frequency then decreases until the fifth novel KOFU, and decreases again until the ninth novel HIGA when it begins to increase dramatically. The frequency reaches its highest point (1,744 tokens) in KOKO and drops steeply before climbing up again slightly. As for third person pronouns (3PPs), they are rarely used in the first half of Soseki's novels but their numbers increase dramatically after a dip in KOKO. Of the first five novels, four are written in first person narrative style and Soseki’s first attempt to write in third person narrative, GUBI, is not free from the legacy of Edo literature, with occasional appearances of the author in the novel. These facts indicate the difficulty and struggles Soseki faced in writing third person narrative novels.

This diachronic chart shows both first and third person narratives indiscriminately. By separating the novels according to narrative type, the changes become clearer, as shown in the following sub sections.

5.3.3 First person narrative

Chart 5-B shows the frequencies of personal pronouns in Soseki’s first person narrative novels. The main contributors to the increase in the total frequency of personal pronouns in the first person narrative novels are, not surprisingly, the 1PPs. The relative infrequency of 1PPs in his earlier novels shows that it was possible to narrate a story in the first person without overtly indicating the narrator's presence with pronouns. The frequency of 2PPs is almost consistent across all novels. 3PPs are used sparingly in earlier novels but their frequency increases in HIGA and KOJI before declining in KOKO. A large part of KOKO is written in a letter format, and this could be the reason of the less frequent use of 3PPs in this novel.

---

2 Higansugimade was written in both the first person and third person narrative styles. The figures shown on Chart 2 only concern the part written as a first person narrative, approx. 77,000 characters and on Chart 3 the part written as a third person narrative, approx. 118,200 characters.
5.3.4 Third person narrative

Chart 5-C shows the frequencies of PPs in Soseki’s novels written as third person narratives.

1PPs and 2PPs have almost identical curves and do not show much change other than a very slow increase in the latter half of his writing. On the other hand, 3PPs are
hardly visible in the early novels, but then make a dramatic climb after MON. The unusually high frequency of 3PPs in MICH is likely to be attributable to the different style of the novel. MICH is considered to be the most autobiographical novel of all Soseki’s novels and has a confessional style. The Naturalist writers who were active at that time made use of kare (he) as a thinly disguised I in their confessional novels. Thus one possible explanation for the high numbers of 3PPs in MICH is that Soseki was under the influence of the Naturalist writing. Tanizaki (1959: 58) claims that no writer was unaffected by Naturalism at that time. Without MICH, Chart 5-C would have a steadier upward curve of 3PPs. MICH is further investigated in Chapter 7 and Tanizaki’s claim is also questioned in Chapter 9.

As Charts 5-B and 5-C show, the use of 3PPs is more frequent in third person than in first person narrative novels. Also, the frequency increases as Soseki’s writing progresses and he fully acquires the technique of third person narrative writing.

5.4 Quantitative analyses: third person narrative

The previous section indicated a strong connection between the increased frequency of 3PPs and the acquisition of the third person narrative in Soseki’s writing. The following sections will focus on 3PPs in third person narrative novels in order to find the mechanism behind the dramatic increase in 3PP use.

5.4.1 Two types of third person pronouns

There are two types of 3PPs in Japanese. One is a combination of the demonstratives kono, sono, and ano (roughly translated as ‘this’, ‘that’ (near you) and ‘that/over there’) + the nouns hito or kata (person), otoko (man) and onna (woman). These are referred to as the ko-so-a type. The ko-so-a type is considered to be a traditional Japanese pronoun type (Okumura 1954). The other type consists of kare (he), kanojo (she) and karera (they), and is called the kare type. Although these are often referred to as neologisms created through translation, Li’s (2002) research (see 5.2.1) shows that kare has a long and complicated history in Japanese.
Chart 5-D shows the frequencies of these two types of 3PPs in Soseki’s novels written as third person narratives. While the ko-so-a type 3PP stays relatively infrequent throughout these novels, the kare type 3PP shows a sharp increase in SORE and reaches a peak in MICH. It is now apparent that what actually contributed to the dramatic increase in frequency of 3PPs is the kare type. Although it is not shown on the chart, the majority (over 99%) of these kare type 3PPs appear in the narrative (rather than the dialogue) components of Soseki’s text.

### Chart 5-D Frequencies of kare 3PPs and ko-so-a 3PPs (per 100,000 characters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GUBI</th>
<th>SAN</th>
<th>SORE</th>
<th>MON</th>
<th>HIGA</th>
<th>MICH</th>
<th>MEI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ko-so-a</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his first two novels written as third person narratives, GUBI and SAN, the kare type hardly appears. The frequency increase between SAN and SORE is from 11 to 216 tokens. This seems to be a large increase in just one year. GUBI may not be classified as third person narrative in the strict sense since the author appears in the text and makes a few comments on the story. Although this does not happen in SAN, Soseki seems still reluctant to use 3PPs. Instead he resorts to the use of common nouns and proper nouns as terms of reference in this novel.

### 5.4.2 Pronominal use of common nouns otoko and onna in Sanshirō (SAN)

In early Meiji novels, it is a common practice to refer to characters as otoko (man), onna (woman), shosei (student) or musume (young woman) in the narrative until the narrator reveals their identities (Kubo 1986: 104). Once the identities are known, the characters’ personal names are used instead. Tsubouchi Shoyo (1859-1935) and
Futabatei Shimei (1864-1909) often used this technique.

Soseki also employed the practice in his early novels. For instance, the characters, Kyūichi in KUSA, Munechika and Kōno in GUBI, and Yojirō in SAN are each referred to repeatedly as ‘young man’, ‘angular man’ and ‘thin man’, and ‘the man who sat next to me’ respectively, until their names are revealed. But in some cases, Soseki continues to use *otoko* and *onna* even after introducing his characters’ names. This phenomenon is mostly observed in his early to middle novels, such as KUSA, GUBI, SAN and HIGA, and disappears in his later novels, once the use of 3PPs becomes more established. Hence, I hypothesize that the common nouns *otoko* (man) and *onna* (woman) are used, to at least some extent, as transitional 3PP substitutes before the third person pronouns, *kare* (he) and *kanojo* (she), become established in Soseki’s writing.

Soseki’s sixth novel SAN (1908) contains many examples of the above-mentioned phenomenon. In SAN, there are only eight tokens of *kare* and none of *kanojo*. Compared to this there are 62 tokens of *otoko* or modifier + *otoko*, and 275 of *onna* or modifier + *onna* forms\(^3\) acting as personal pronouns. Table 5-4 shows the distribution of these. The initial tokens of these terms are collected using a keyword search function on the CD-ROM (1997) and then, are manually sorted according to their referents.

| Table 5-4 Referential use of *otoko* and *onna* and their distribution in Sanshirō (1908) (raw figures) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Characters | Pre-identity-revelation | Post-identity-revelation |
| | *otoko* / *onna* | modifier + *otoko* / onna | | *otoko* / onna | modifier + *otoko* / onna | *kare* / *kanojo* |
| **M** | | | | | | |
| Sanshirō | | | | 13 | 1 |
| Hirotar | 7 | | | | 24 |
| Yojirō | | 8 | | 1 | |
| Jūjutsuka | | 9 | | | |
| **F** | | | | | | |
| Mineko | 33 | 12 | 120 | 8 |
| Yoshiko | | | 15 | 8 |
| Woman on the train | 47 | 9 | | |
| Woman in a dream | 3 | 7 | | |
| Mineko & Yoshiko | | | 9 | 2 |

M: male, F: female

The characters, *Jūjutsuka* (the masseur, M), the woman on the train, and the woman

---

\(^3\) The figures do not include the lexical uses of *otoko* and *onna*. 
in a dream, all remain anonymous. Hirota (M) and Yojiro (M) cease to be referred to as *otoko* (except for one incident) after the disclosure of their identity. Instead, their personal names are used, following the convention. However, in the cases of the three main characters, Sanshiro (M), Mineko (F) and Yoshiko (F), *otoko* and *onna* continue to be used along with their personal names as terms of reference in the narrative. This suggests the pronominal use of the common nouns, *otoko* and *onna*, since these terms in such situations have little lexical meaning. The occurrences of *onna* in reference to the two women (Mineko and Yoshiko) show the inclusion of both singular and plural in one form.

*Otoko* and *onna* are often used as in the following example (English translations and underlining for all the examples are mine, unless otherwise indicated).

1. Mugon no mama Sanshiro o mimamotta sugata ni, *otoko* wa mushiro amai kurushimi o kanjita. (*Sanshiro* 1978:171)


To follow the common practice of the early Meiji narrative style (e.g. Kubo 1986: 104-5), the personal male name “Sanshiro” should be repeated in the second clause of the above example. In contemporary writing, *kare* is normally used. The use of *otoko* in the above example seems to indicate the transitory use of a common noun as a quasi pronoun. This kind of pronominal use of *otoko* and *onna* is most frequent in KUSA*, GUBI, HIGA and SAN, less frequent in MON and KOJI*, and not used in other novels. (*First person narrative novels)

The shift from proper nouns to *otoko* and *onna* seems to happen when the couple – Sanshiro and Mineko – is romantically involved and the physical distance between them lessens. The following examples, as well as example (1) in SAN, show the situations when Sanshiro and Mineko are face to face with each other.

---

4 A similar use of *otoko* and *onna* are found in “Genji monogatari” (*The Tale of Genji*, 1021). The references to the main protagonists, Hikaru Genji and Murasaki no ue, switch from the commonly used *Taisho no kimi* for Genji and *Himegimi* for Murasaki to *otoko gimi* and *onna gimi* respectively after their first night together. Likewise, the other couple, Kaoru and Ukifune, is referred to as *otoko* and *onna* in the same situation (Koike 1994: 81).
(2) *Onna* no koe wa ushiro de kikoeta. Sanshirō wa furimukanakereba naranakatta. *Onna to otoko* wa jika ni kao o miawaseta. (*Sanshirō* 1978:170)

(The woman’s voice came from behind. Sanshirō had to look back. *The woman* and the *man* faced each other.)

(3) *Onna* ga “Ogawa san” to iu. *Otoko* wa hachi no ji o yosete, sora wa mite ita kao o *onna* no hō e muketa. (*Sanshirō* 1978:183)

(The woman said, “Ogawa-san.” *The man* was looking up at the sky with a grimace, then turned his face towards *the woman*.)

By comparison, in Soseki’s later novels, *kare* and *kanojo* are used instead of *otoko* and *onna* in situations like these.

(4) Ita no ma made kite soko de pitarito tomatta toki no *kanojo* wa, *Tsuda* ni totte isshu no e de atta. *Kare* wa wasureru koto no dekinai insho no hitotsu to shite, sore o nochinochi made jibun no kokoro ni tsutaeta. (*Meian Ge* 1978: 245)

(*She*, who came up to the timber floor and then stopped abruptly, was a kind of picture to *Tsuda.* He kept it as an unforgettable image in his mind for a long, long time.)

Table 5-5 shows the normalised tokens of *kare, kanojo, otoko, and onna* in Soseki’s third person narrative novels. *Kanojo* as the third person female singular pronoun does not appear at all until 1910, half way through Soseki’s career. Although there are two separate appearances of *kanojo* before 1910 in novels written as first person narratives, one in NEKO (1905) and another in KUSA (1906), these tokens refer to “female gender” and “camellias” respectively. The moderately high frequency of *otoko* and *onna* as terms of reference in the middle part of Soseki’s career, and their disappearance and the increased use of *kare* and *kanojo* in his later novels, again, indicate the transitional use of *otoko* and *onna* as 3PPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GUBI 1907</th>
<th>SAN 1908</th>
<th>SORE 1909</th>
<th>MON 1910</th>
<th>HIGA 1911</th>
<th>MICHI 1915</th>
<th>MEI 1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kare</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>otoko</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onna</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>303</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This claim is backed by Soseki’s use of *otoko* and *onna* for his translation of a
passage from *Beauchamp's Career* (1876) that appears in KUSA (1906). Example (5) is a sentence from the original English text and (6) is the same sentence quoted as a translation in Soseki’s novel.

(5) Tenderness breathed from her, in voice, in look, in touch; for she accepted his help that he might lead her to the stern of the vessel, to gaze well on setting Venice, and sent lightnings up his veins; (*Beauchamp’s Career* 1950: 68)

(6) Nasake no kaze ga onna kara fuku. Koe kara, me kara, hadae kara fuku. Otoko ni tasukerarete tomo ni iku onna wa, yuugure no Venisu wo nagamuru tame ka, tasukuru otoko wa waga myaku ni inazuma no chi o hasirasu tame ka. (Soseki’s translation in *Kusamakura*1998: 110)

The Number of PPs is reduced from six in the original to four in Soseki’s translation. Nevertheless, Soseki uses *otoko* and *onna* in the places of *he* and *she* and this method is consistent throughout the passage (approx. one page) quoted in KUSA. In other words, there is no appearance of *kare, kanojo, karera*, nor *ko-so-a* type 3PPs. Instead, *otoko* and *onna* are used consistently as personal pronouns.

5.4.3 Personal names (proper nouns) and *kare and kanojo*
Chart 5-D showed the increased frequency of the *kare* type 3PP against the low frequency of the *ko-so-a* type. Chart 5-E shows the different frequencies of *kare, kanojo* and *karera* within the *kare* type in Soseki’s third person narratives in diachronic order.

**Chart 5-E Frequencies of *kare, kanojo and karera* in third person narrative**
(per 100,000 characters)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KARE</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KANOJO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARERA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first two novels have very few tokens of *kare (he), kanojo (she)* and *karera*
(they). The plural *karera* stays relatively low in frequency while the singular forms *kare* and *kanojo* show dramatic increases. *Kare* increases first and has the highest frequency. The female form *kanojo* appears later in Soseki’s writing but quickly follows *kare*. The question is how the increased uses of these 3PPs affected the existing terms of reference.

As mentioned earlier, it was a common practice in the early Meiji period to use personal names once the identities of characters were revealed in the narrative. My investigation shows that Soseki adopted the common nouns *otoko* and *onna* as transitional third person pronouns in his novels written in the middle part of his writing career. This section will investigate how the increased use of *kare* and *kanojo* in the narratives of the latter half of his career affected the use of personal names as terms of reference.

As a basis for comparison, the main male protagonist and the main female protagonist in seven novels written as third person narratives are chosen. The frequencies of their personal names are computer-generated and of *kare* and *kanojo* for each protagonist are manually sorted from the initial tokens acquired through keyword search.

**Chart 5-F Frequencies of personal names and *kare* (per 100,000 characters)**

Chart 5-F shows the frequencies of firstly, the main male protagonist’s name and
secondly, the pronoun *kare* referring to that protagonist in each of Soseki’s third person narrative novels. In the first two novels on the chart, nearly all terms of reference for main protagonists are personal names. In *SORE* (1909) and *MON* (1910) *kare* has about a quarter of the tokens of personal names. Then the frequencies of both personal name and *kare* decrease markedly in *HIGA*. However, they recover quickly in *MICH* (1915), in which *kare* is, for the first time in Soseki’s novels, used more frequently than personal names. But this does not necessarily mean that *kare* is replacing personal names as a term of reference. While *kare* is used more frequently in this novel, the use of personal names does not diminish greatly. Further investigation of *kare* will follow in Chapter 7.

**Chart 5-G Frequencies of personal names and *kanojo* (per 100,000 characters)**

Chart 5-G shows the frequencies of firstly, the main female protagonist’s name and secondly, the pronoun *kanojo* referring to that protagonist in each of Soseki’s third person narrative novels. *Kanojo* starts to appear regularly in narrative in Charts 5-G much later than *kare* does in Chart 5-F, it follows a similar progression to *kare*. Likewise, *kanojo* is not obviously replacing personal names but rather co-existing with them and the total frequencies of the two types of reference are on the increase. In other words, the terms of reference in general are becoming more visible in Soseki’s later writing.

Also in Chart 5-G, personal names show steady increases in the first half of Soseki’s novels but decrease dramatically in *HIGA* (1911) just before *kanojo* becomes regularly used in *MICH* (1909).
5.5 Conclusion

Soseki’s use of 3PPs in his novels reveals the transitional process of kare, kanojo and karera, each of which was at a different stage of integration in narrative writing. Kare, originally used as a demonstrative to indicate far distance, gradually became a multi-purpose (referring to human, non-human, male, female, singular and plural) third person pronoun. By the end of the Edo period, its plural form, karera, had emerged and co-existed with kare, but kare was still used for plural albeit less frequently. In Soseki’s writing, the separation of the female singular kanojo from kare, and its increasing use are observed in connection with the acquired use of third person narrative. In addition to personal names that are traditional terms of reference, kare and kanojo increased in frequency, and by the end of his career the ratio of personal names to 3PPs was almost equal. The common nouns otoko and onna are also used as transitional third person pronoun substitutes to bridge these two types of third person reference. The process of the use of various transitional forms is further examined in Chapter 8 and well illustrated in Figure 8-1. This method is observed also in Soseki’s translation inserted in a novel.

The frequency increase appears to be sudden when the tokens of kare and kanojo alone are considered. However, increase in the referential use of both personal names and the common nouns otoko and onna had preceded the increased use of kare and kanojo. And in addition, the layering of multiple forms had occurred. Thus, the frequency increase of third person reference as a whole showed a more gradual progression.

All these facts illustrate a period of change where old forms were receding while new forms were introduced, and old forms were reinvented to create a number of synchronic variations before the restructuring of the paradigm was complete.
Chapter 6
Narrative vs. Dialogue

6.1 Introduction

The evidence presented in Chapter 5 shows that in Soseki’s writing, the major contributor to the frequency increase of 3PPs was the *kare* type, while the *ko-so-a* type maintained a low frequency. This chapter further investigates the two types according to the dialogue and narrative parts of Soseki’s novels. The finding will be compared with the results from another investigation of the same elements in late Edo and early Meiji novels.

The chapter has two main sections. The first is a corpus-based quantitative investigation of the *kare* 3PPs and *ko-so-a* 3PPs in Soseki’s major novels that are divided into dialogue and narrative. Its aims are:

a) to identify the pattern of Soseki’s use of the two types of 3PPs throughout his career in order to find whether they are any more or less prominent in either dialogue or narrative, and
b) to find out whether each component of the *ko-so-a* set shows a similar pattern of use or not.

The second section of the chapter has three sub-sections. First, the use of the pronouns in the Edo period is investigated using selected novels that belong to different genres of fiction. Second, selected novels from the Meiji period, written before Soseki began his writing career, are investigated. These include the two pioneering modern novels, Tsubouchi Shōyō’s *Tōsei shosei katagi* (*The Ways of Present-day Students*, 1885), Futabatei Shimei’s *Ukigumo* (*The Drifting Clouds*, 1887), and Mori Ogai’s German trilogy – *Maihime* (*The Dancing Girl*, 1890), *Utakata no ki* (*Marie*, 1890), and *Fumidukai* (*The Messenger*, 1891). Finally, the results from the two periods are compared with each other as well as with the data from Soseki’s novels, in order to place Soseki’s pronoun use in a historical context.
6.2 Kare 3PPs and ko-so-a 3PPs in Soseki’s novels

This section will focus on Soseki’s use of the two types of 3PPs – kare and ko-so-a in dialogue and narrative.

6.2.1 Paradigms of 3PPs

Although, both kare and ko-so-a types are now categorized as 3PPs, it was not until recently that the kare type made an entry into modern Japanese dictionaries and grammar books as 3PPs, and some still do not recognize it as such. For instance, a high school grammar, Watakuhitachi no kokubunpō (Our National Grammar, 1985), has no entry for the kare type in the section on personal pronouns. On the other hand, the ko-so-a type has been regarded as 3PPs ever since Sakuma (1936) formulated the ko-so-a-do (roughly translated as here, there, over there and where) paradigm.

Sakuma noticed there is a systematic order in Japanese demonstratives that include demonstrative pronouns, demonstrative adjectives and demonstrative adverbs. He categorized these terms according to the distance from the speaker, kinshō (near the speaker), chūshō (near the listener), enshō (far from both the speaker and the listener) and futeishō (interrogatives). Kinshō includes kore (this – pronoun), kochira (this way – pronoun), kono (this – adjective), etc. Chūshō includes sore (that – pronoun: near you), sochira (that way – pronoun), sono (that – adjective), etc. Enshō includes are (that – pronoun: far), achira (that way over there – pronoun), ano (that – adjective: far), etc. Futeishō includes dore (which one – pronoun), dochira (which way – pronoun), dono (which – adjective), etc. Sakuma called this system the ko-so-a-do paradigm according to the first syllable of the terms belonging to each group. However, the kare type somehow escaped this classification and is not included in Sakuma’s list of Pronouns. (Table 1-3 presents a simple classification of these various terms.)

Sakuma (1957: 32) himself states the kare type’s affiliation with translation as the reason for its exclusion from the 3PP. This is a view shared by many other scholars. The kare 3PPs are often referred to as neologisms created through translation.
(Yanase 2000, Yanabu 1996, Hirota 1969, Shinmura 1945). The same scholars generally regard the *ko-so-a* 3PPs as the prototype of traditional Japanese pronouns (Okumura 1954). Mikami (1972: 174-89) includes *kare* in his *ko-so-a-do* chart as a part of “*a*” (far area) but qualifies it as an old Japanese term and separates it from the modern *kare* as a term used in translation. Shōho (1984: 60), on the other hand, states that only *kare*, *kanojo* and *karera* should be classified as 3PPs and *konohito*, *sonohito* and *anohito* as demonstratives. Li (2003) recently demonstrated that *kare* has actually been around in the Japanese literary scene for many centuries, first as a demonstrative and later as a personal pronoun. Contrary to Mikami, he considers the modern *kare* as an amalgam of old Japanese and translation originated in Chinese. This difficulty of obtaining a consensus among scholars indicates the unstable position of the 3PP in Japanese.

However, when two different lexical sets exist with approximately the same meaning and value, there are usually differences in function (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 23). Are there such differences between these two sets of 3PPs? If so, what are the differences? Could the co-existence of the two types be portrayed as “the progressive aggregation of instances of the newer B construction [in this case, the *kare* type] at the expense of the older A construction [the *ko-so-a* type]”? (Hopper & Traugott p.67) Is the *kare* type slowly displacing the *ko-so-a* type, as Yanabu (1996) and other scholars suggest? Or does their co-existence mean that each has found a niche? These are the questions to be addressed in the following investigation.

**6.2.2 Okumura’s research**

As a preface to the investigation, Okumura Tsuneya’s study has to be mentioned briefly. His article on 3PPs is one of the earliest academic investigations of modern Japanese 3PPs and is still quoted by many contemporary scholars1. His article, “*Daimeishi kare, kanojo, karera no kosatsu*” (*A Study of Pronouns, Kare, Kanojo and Karera*, 1954), starts with a question “why are the *kare* type pronouns not shown as 3PPs in grammar books? “ (p. 63). Okumura suggests that the Japanese language does not have authentic 3PPs and, therefore, substitutes demonstratives for them. The ‘substitutions’, he adds, are the *ko-so-a* 3PPs, and “the *kare* type pronouns that

---

1 Papers by Hirota Eitarō (1953) and Kikuzawa Sueo (1935-40) are two of the few studies published before Okumura's.
belong to a different pronominal system” (P. 63). By ‘a different pronominal system’ he means not a homegrown but ‘a foreign system’. His view seems to represent that of the scholars of his time. For example, both Sakuma (1951) and Hashimoto (1946) excluded the kare type from 3PPs in their respective books on Japanese grammar. Contemporary scholars seem to maintain similar views on 3PPs: Yanase (2000) advocates the eradication of kare and kanojo in translation and Yanabu (1996) denies the existence of 3PPs even in present-day Japanese.

Okumura’s investigation has lead him to translation and the genbunitchi (an early modern colloquial writing) movement. He found that the kare type is not used in dialogue while the ko-so-a type is infrequent in narrative. From these findings, he raises more questions:

- Did the genbunitchi movement introduce the kare type into writing?
- Does Japanese need the kare type?
- Why is the kare type not used in dialogue?
- Why is the ko-so-a type infrequent in narrative?

Okumura’s answers are that the ko-so-a type is never free from its deictic origins and is always associated with one’s standpoint (speaker/addressee/other) and with honorific values. He explains that “the kare 3PPs which do not have a deictic quality” do not function comfortably in dialogue, where the speaker and the addressee create a specific deictic situation (p. 72). In narrative, on the other hand, where a more neutral description of the story is required, pronouns of neutral values are sought out. Thus, the kare 3PPs were introduced into modern narrative writing in the Meiji period. In short, according to him, the necessity to create a neutral narrative style facilitated the introduction of the kare 3PPs. Further, Okumura stresses that the introduction of the kare 3PPs “meant not to replace the existing the ko-so-a type, but to fill a vacant space that had been previously unoccupied” (p. 71).

Okumura’s research (1954: 63), while displaying insight in investigation, is limited to a small number of novels and based on unproven assumptions: for example, “the kare type has no deictic value” and “the ko-so-a 3PPs are traditional Japanese 3PPs”.
And his conclusion that the *kare* 3PPs were introduced into Japanese writing in order to fill a vacant gap in the language will be questioned and tested.

### 6.2.3 Quantitative outline of pronoun distribution in dialogue and narrative

The analysis of the data will proceed on two different levels. First, in order to find out the general development, concordance data will serve as a data source. For this, Soseki’s 13 novels are divided into narrative and dialogue using online texts (*Aozora bunko*), and the frequencies of *kare, kanojo, karera* and the *ko-so-a* 3PPs are counted with a keyword search function. Second, more detailed investigation will then be carried out on selected novels that have proved, in the first analysis, to be suitable candidates for more extensive qualitative investigation. For the detailed annotations and different forms of *kanji* characters, *Soseki zenshū* (Iwanami shoten) are consulted. To place the findings in an historical context, the results will be compared with Okumura’s previous research (1954).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-1 Tokens of 3PPs in dialogue and narrative of Soseki’s novels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tokens (raw figures)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-1 shows the results of the initial corpus investigation in raw figures and normalized figures. As Okumura’s findings, the *kare* type hardly appears in dialogue in Soseki’s novels. There are only 11 tokens of *kare* in dialogue, compared with 4,697 tokens in narrative. *Kanojo* does not appear in dialogue at all. The plural, *karera*, is slightly more dispersed with 17 tokens appearing in dialogue, but can hardly be considered frequent when compared with its occurrence in narrative at 512. Even considering the ratio of dialogue and narrative (1:3), this is still clearly an overwhelming tendency of the *kare* 3PPs to appear in narrative. From these figures it is reasonable to conclude that the *kare* type predominantly appears in narrative in Soseki’s novels.

As for the *ko-so-a* type, contrary to Okumura’s (1954: 75) claim of it appearing predominantly in dialogue, Table 6-1 shows the results of the initial corpus investigation in raw figures. As previously noted, the *kare* type hardly appears in dialogue in Soseki’s novels. There are only 11 tokens of *kare* in dialogue, compared
with 4,697 in narrative. Kanojo does not appear in dialogue at all. The plural, karera, is slightly more dispersed with 17 tokens appearing in dialogue, but can hardly be considered frequent when compared with its occurrence in narrative at 512. Even considering the ratio of dialogue and narrative (1 : 3), there is still clearly an overwhelming tendency of the kare 3PPs to appear in narrative. From these figures it is reasonable to conclude that the kare type predominantly appears in narrative in Soseki’s novels.

As for the ko-so-a type, contrary to Okumura’s (1954: 75) claim that it appears predominantly in dialogue, Table 6-1 shows slightly higher tokens in narrative in raw figures. But if the amount of dialogue was increased to that of narrative, the figure of the ko-so-a type would be nearly three times that in narrative. However, normalising the figures here is of no great benefit since the proportion of dialogue in Soseki’s novels stays relatively constant at around 25% – rising above 30% in only three of his works (see column 3 on Table 6-2 below). Okumura’s figures are also based on raw figures. Detailed investigation of each of the ko-so-a set is required in order to find out the reason for the discrepancy.

6.2.4 Further investigation on ko-so-a 3PPs
While analyzing the difference between the kare type and the ko-so-a type pronouns, some differences in use among the ko, so and a categories surfaced and it is essential to investigate these separately to really know how they function. As mentioned earlier, ko, so and a, on their own, are demonstratives and ko roughly indicates something/someone close to the speaker, so something/someone close to the addressee, and a something/someone which is close to neither the speaker nor the addressee. The distance indicated by these terms can be physical, temporal or psychological. Therefore, the ko-so-a 3PPs, which combine demonstratives and common nouns (person – hito or kata, man – otoko and woman – onna), inevitably maintain the deictic characteristics of the original demonstratives as well as the honorific values indicated by the distance between the referent and the speaker and addressee. This section will investigate how these differences in the reference spheres of ko, so and a are reflected in Soseki’s novels.

Table 6-2 shows the tokens of the ko-, so-, and a-pronouns in the dialogue and
narrative parts of Soseki’s 13 novels. The third column from the left shows the percentages of dialogue in each novel. The ko-pronoun has a higher frequency in narrative with 81%. The so-pronoun also shows a tendency to appear more in narrative with 65.1%, though not as consistently as the ko-pronoun. On the other hand, the a-pronoun has the opposite distribution, with 78% in dialogue. Although, it should be noted that, in several novels the so-pronoun appears more in dialogue, and in KOFU the a-pronoun appears more in narrative, these are all small tokens and therefore not significant enough to be regarded as counter-examples. KOJI shows a different pattern of use with more so-pronouns in dialogue and unusually large tokens (45) of the a-pronouns in narrative. This novel will be closely investigated in Chapter 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of D</th>
<th>ko</th>
<th>so</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEKO</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTC</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUBI</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFU</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOJI</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOKO</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In summary, the data from this first investigation of Soseki’s novels suggests the following interpretation: in the majority of cases the kare type pronouns show a higher frequency in narrative. On the other hand, the ko-so-a type pronouns, as a whole, do not display a significant leaning towards either dialogue or narrative. Further investigation of each member of the ko-so-a set reveals that only the a-pronoun is strongly inclined to occur in dialogue, at nearly 80%, with the so-pronoun and ko-pronouns leaning strongly towards the narrative, at 65% and 81% respectively. On the basis of these findings, the initial hypothesis suggested by Okumura, that the kare type predominantly appear in narrative and the ko-so-a type in dialogue, has to be modified to a more focused suggestion: the kare type 3PPs.
predominantly appear in narrative, and the a-pronoun in dialogue. The data examined has shown this to be true at least in Soseki’s novels.

6.3 Kare/kano and are/ano in Edo and Meiji novels

The previous section demonstrated that out of the ko-so-a 3PPs, the a-pronoun, unlike the ko and so pronouns, appears mostly in dialogue, complementing the use of the kare 3PPs that appear predominantly in narrative. However, it is not certain that this distinct use of each type for dialogue and narrative had been the case before Soseki’s time, or even was so among his contemporaries. This chapter will examine late Edo and the early Meiji novels in comparison with those of Soseki and find out whether the same pattern exists in the former.

6.3.1 Edo novels

The focus of this section is on kare and are, and their adjective forms, kano and ano, out of many varieties that belong to the two types of 3PPs in selected Edo novels from the late 18th to mid 19th century in order to identify the pattern of use before direct contact with the West. These novels are categorized in various genres according to their form (size, colour of cover, etc.), readership (intellectuals, merchants, children, women, etc.) and content. They can be placed roughly in two groups: (1) kusazōshi – popular colloquial picture novels and (2) yomihon – formal narrative prose (text-based stories as distinct from picture books). Group (1) includes sharebon (novels based in the pleasure quarters), kokkeibon (comic stories) and ninjobon (love stories), and largely written in kana syllabary. Group (2) is written in formal Chinese (kanbun kundoku) or formal Japanese (wabun) style. Women and children were the main readers of kusazōshi, and the samurai class and educated merchants, of yomihon.

The texts used for the investigation are shown in Table 6-3. A variety of writers were selected for each genre to obtain a generic pattern rather than individual tendencies. When texts are available electronically (see References), the tokens have been counted using a key word search function; otherwise they have been manually counted. The selection of texts is based on their popularity, conformity to the genre
and availability in electronic form. Although efforts were made to choose texts amounting to a similar total length for each genre, it was difficult to do so. For instance, *sharebon* stories tend to be very short.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-3 Edo novels used for investigation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formal novels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yomihon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colloquial novels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharebon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokkeibon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninjōbon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.3.2 *Kare/kano* and *are/ano* in dialogue and narrative

Table 6-4 shows the tokens of *kare/kano* and *are/ano* in dialogue and narrative of the two groups of Edo novels examined ((1) and (2) above). The majority of the counting process here has been manually done, since the most of these novels is not available in an electronic text format. The figures do not include the compound words such as *karekore* (that and this), *sorekare* (that and that) and *arekore* (that and this). Normalised figures of colloquial novels are shown in the bottom half for a fair comparison to the *yomihon* group that has shorter texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-4 Tokens of kare, kano, are and ano in Edo novels (raw and normalised figures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Genre</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yomihon</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Colloquial novels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of dialogue in each genre are shown in the fourth column from the left. The figures in *yomihon* are placed in brackets for the following reason. While dialogue in colloquial novels is easy to see since it is written in a smaller font size,
that in *yomihon* is much harder to distinguish from narrative. This is largely because of the absence of quotation marks and of any syntactic distinction equivalent to that between direct and indirect speech in English. As Sakai (1991: 140) notes, “the concept of quotation, of distinguishing a speech of one person from that of another, was absent in the discursive space” in *yomihon*. The percentage of dialogue (35%) in *yomihon* in Table 6-4 is derived from the modern printed and edited versions in which quotation marks are added by the editors. However, this figure has to be treated with caution because the absence of distinction between dialogue and narrative means that the texts are written in one uniform formal style (quite often in *kanbun kundoku* style) and the dialogue does not reflect the colloquial speech of the time. In this sense, it might even be reasonable to say that *yomihon* is all written as narrative.

The tendencies depicted in Table 6-4 are:

(A) *yomihon*
   - use predominantly *kare/kano*

(B) colloquial novels (*sharebon, kokkeibon and ninjōbon*)
   - use *are/ano* as the main 3PPs
   - *are/ano* appear almost exclusively in dialogue
   - use *kano* mainly in narrative with only a few tokens in dialogue

(C) both *yomihon* and colloquial novels
   - have tokens of *kano*

The above features suggest the strong affinities of *kare/kano* for formal *yomihon* and *are/ano* for colloquial picture novels, while *kano* serves for both groups of novels.

At the same time, some figures can be misleading without knowledge of style of the Edo novels. Example (1) shows the only token of *are* in *yomihon*.

(1) かの鬼ことに逢来る。あれに近寄るかふと隠れ感ふを。人々はいつくにと立騒ぐ。
    *Kano oni koko ni oikitaru. Are ni chikayoritamauna to kakure madouo. Hitobito so wa*
Although the original text does not have quotation marks, as the translation indicates, two separate utterances are embedded in the example passage in which the distinction between dialogue and narrative is blurred. This is why kare/kano seem to appear both in dialogue and narrative. In the example above, kano and are appear to be sharing the same narrative space, but in actual fact, kano oni (the demon) is in narrative and are (it) is in dialogue. Because this is the only token of are in all four novels of yomihon, one is tempted to ask if there may have been a possibility of the typological mistake in the process of publication of the original. It requires further investigation using the existing variety of original woodblock prints. Apart from the single token of are, Ugetsu monogatari does not have any other tokens of are/ano. The novel is written in the style particular to yomihon, in which dialogue is written in the manner of a narrative as mentioned above. This allows kare/kano to appear in dialogue. However, from a stylistic point of view, it is not impossible to say that yomihon is all in narrative; therefore one might conclude that kare/kano has a tendency to appear in narrative but not in dialogue.

Similarly, narrative in colloquial novels is often written in a formal style. This explains why, in spite of very small proportions of narrative, more tokens of kano appear in them. In other words, although kano appears in colloquial novels, it is still associated with a formal narrative style.

So far the affinity of kare/kano with formal yomihon novels has been suggested. If this is the case, a question arises as to why there are some tokens of kano in the dialogue of colloquial picture novels. The following example could provide an answer.

(2) きのとりえりよみ本を好みて、かし本やより倶本にて見る人(...)なり。此人万事につきて今やねのよみ本文章をいひたるがくせあり。(...)いん「わっちは読本といふ読本を暗記（そらんじ）しているから、つひ平生の事も、あの読になつてどうもならねへ (...) えは「木、土竜か。高慢な口ぶりだのう。何をいふか。唐人の黙言ばかり云居るぜ。あれどもア話をするもしじねのも同じ事だ。」

Kono Doryō wa eiri yomihon o kenomite, kashihonya yori kashihon nite miru hito (...) nari. Kono hito manji ni tuite imayō no yomihon bunshō o itagaru kuse arī. (...) Dōryō - Watchi wa yomihon to iu yomihon o soranjite iru kara, tsui heizei no koto mo, anō kotoba ni natte
This is a passage from *Ukiyodoko* (*The hairdresser of the floating world*, 1812). Doryū is a self-confessed fan of *yomihon* and admits that his speech is heavily influenced by *yomihon* narrative. The other character, Chabo, dismisses his speech as ‘pompous’ and ‘Chinese jibbers’. His comment and the fact that all five tokens of *kano* in *Ukiyodoko* appear in Doryū’s speech (there is no token of *kare*) suggest that a very particular type of person used it in speech and that it is considered to be odd. This is an example of speech mimicking writing and *kano* is used to illustrate Doryū’s unusual way of speaking. Likewise, when *kare* or *kano* appears in dialogue, it is often used for a special effect.

As Chabo aptly described Doryū’s speech as “Chinese jibbers”, a large proportion of *yomihon* is, in fact, adaptation of popular Chinese fiction, *baihua*, and is said to convey some characteristics of it (Li 2002, Nakamura 1973). For example, each of the nine stories that comprise *Hanabusa zoshi* (1750) is an adaptation of one or more *baihua* stories (Nakamura 1973: 32). Thus, the frequent use of *kare* in *yomihon* is considered to be an example of interference through *baihua* (Li 2002: 373-387), since the first stage of adaptation was achieved by word-for-word translation, and original *kanji* characters in the Chinese texts are often transferred into Japanese in the process (Nakamura 1989). The use of the *kanji* character 彼 for *kare* instead of 彼 in some *yomihon* stories in this period illustrates this. Normally, the *kanji* 彼 has been used for 3PP in Japanese since its arrival in Japan in the sixth century. However, sometime in the Tang Dynasty (618-906) in China, 彼 became the 3PP, slowly displacing 彼, and it remains the 3PP to this day. Therefore, 彼 was the 3PP used in *baihua* stories. Most Japanese translations of *baihua* during the Edo period used 彼 rather than 彼 (Li 2002: 374) and this practice is often carried into adaptations.

---

2 In Edo colloquial novels *kano* is sometimes used as a noun (e.g. ‘lover’ or ‘wife’) as in the following example: たば「さようのう。彼（かの）がよろしくと云たよ。」
Tabo: Sayono. *Kano* ga yoroshiku to itayo. (*Ukiyoburo* 1809: 323)
(Tabo: Is that so? She (my wife) gave her regards to you.)
(yomihon) as well. Although 他 as a 3PP did not survive much longer in Japanese after the Edo period, it shows a case of temporary but direct transfer of kanji from the original Chinese texts into Japanese.

Sentences (3) and (4) exemplify this use of 他 found in Edo yomihon. Since this process is well documented in Li (2002), only a summary is given here.

(3) 戸自面白に知恵つけて他を逐ひ遠ざけんとすれども、只耳つしてあれば。
    Toji Shiratae ni chie tsukete kare o otozaken to suredomo, tada mimi tsubushte areba...
    (Toji tried to persuade Shiratae to get rid of him [Kotaro], but she covered his ears...)
    Tsuga Tcisho 1766 Shigeshige yawa, p. 93.

(4) もとより他は相識ものなるば。何のはどかりかあるらんとて逐に餌をのむ。
    Motoyori kare wa aishiri mono nariba, nan no habakari ka aran tote tuini esa o nomu.
    (Since he knows [me] well, I thought there would be no problem and finally swallowed
    the bait.)

To summarise the key points of this section, kare/kano appear predominantly in formal fiction represented by yomihon, while are/ano mainly appear in the dialogue of colloquial fiction, such as sharebon, kokkeibon and ninjobon. Furthermore, these two sets of pronouns do not usually mix in a single genre, and when they do, they express a special connotation or situation. From all this evidence, it is possible to conclude that kare/kano have strong affinities for formal writing which does not have a clear distinction between dialogue and narrative, and are/ano for dialogue of colloquial writing in the Edo period. In addition, the frequent use of kare/kano in yomihon is related to their origin as translations of Chinese popular colloquial novels.

6.3.3 Kare/kano and are/ano in Meiji novels

In the Edo literature examined above, kare and are, while sharing a common function as 3PPs, have different uses. Kare appears predominantly in narrative/formal style writing and are in dialogue of colloquial writing. In the Meiji period, which followed, writers experimenting in colloquial writing were faced with a problem of creating a new narrative style that would match dialogue. This was because, in Edo fiction, even in popular picture novels with colloquial dialogue, narrative was often written in a formal style, thus leaving a stylistic gap between the two components of the novel. Komori (1988b: 35) offers “the relationship of dialogue to narration (jinobun) as one of the critical issues of early modern Japanese
literature”.

How they achieved the creation of the new narrative style in colloquial writing has been studied extensively, especially in the fields of literary criticism (e.g. Karatani 1996, Komori 1988a & 1988b) and literary history (e.g. Noguchi 1994). However, linguistic investigations of novels in this period are few and far between, and they tend to deal with small volume of texts or selected passages and examples from a novel (e.g. Aihara 1996 and Koike 1994). Thorough investigations of a large volume of texts are rare. Against this background, Meiji-Taishō novels published between 1885 and 1916 are investigated in this section to find out whether there are any differences in the use of *kare/kano* and *are/ano*, how these differences are reflected in writing styles in comparison to Edo fiction and how they relate to the creation of a new narrative style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6-5 List of Meiji novels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tōsei shosei katagi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukiyōme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maihime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utakata no ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fumi zukai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki’s 13 novels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As source texts, four writers’ novels are chosen. The writers are Tsubouchi Shōyō, Futabatei Shimei, and the two most famous and influential writers of the Meiji period, Natsume Soseki and Mori Ōgai. Table 6-5 lists their novels investigated for the use of *kare/kano* and *are/ano*. Soseki’s 13 novels are the same novels investigated in Chapter 5 (see Table 5-2).

Table 6-6 shows the frequencies of *kare, kano, are* and *ano* referring to humans in the novels of the four writers. Soseki’s novels are divided in two groups, I (1905-8) and II (1909-16), on the basis of a dramatic frequency increase of *kare* in 1909. The distinctive pattern of use with *kare* in narrative and *are* in dialogue found in Edo fiction are somewhat lost in the Meiji novels shown in Table 6-5, in which two writers’ (Shōyō and Soseki) novels have all four terms. Ogai alone maintains the exclusive use of *kare/kano*. Futabatei shows a strong tendency towards the *are/ano* type but has one token of *kare* and *kano* each. Further, *ano*, which appeared only in
Dialogue in Edo novels, is used in narrative as well in Meiji novels. Shōyō’s and the first half of Soseki’s novels display a very mixed use of kare, kano, are and ano. The latter half of Soseki’s novels shows disappearances of kano from dialogue and are from narrative.

Table 6-6 Frequencies of kare/kano and are/ano in the works of four Meiji writers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>writer</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>length</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kano</th>
<th>are</th>
<th>ano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōyō</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>187,500</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futabatei</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>117,403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
<td>1890-1</td>
<td>43,915</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki I</td>
<td>1905-8</td>
<td>991,395</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki II</td>
<td>1909-16</td>
<td>1340,790</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4540</td>
<td>11/1689</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tokens /100,000 characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>writer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōyō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Perhaps the most notable feature is the high frequency of kare in Ogai’s and Soseki’s novels. The frequency of kare in Ogai’s novels (82 tokens in dialogue and 124 in narrative per 100k characters in total) is high, compared to other writers in the table. Only Soseki II has the higher frequency of kare at 446. And Soseki II also has a high frequency of kano(zo) at 171 in narrative only, which does not feature in the novels of any other writers. Since the first two modern novels, Tōsei shosei katagi (Shosei hereafter) and Ukigumo have hardly any or no tokens of kare, those of kare in novels of Ogai and Soseki II seem extreme and seen to have appeared out of nowhere. The clue for these high frequencies of kare, however, may lie in Edo literature.

6.3.4 Comparison of Edo and Meiji novels

The previous section demonstrated particular patterns of pronoun use in Edo and Meiji novels separately. This section will compare the two and investigate the relationship between them. Table 6-7 shows the frequency patterns of kare/kano and are/ano in Edo and Meiji novels investigated in section 6.3.2. It displays even clearer patterns of distribution in the two groups of Edo novels. Yomihon shows a very
strong tendency for kare/kano highlighted in grey and colloquial novels for are/ano, with fewer tokens of kano in narrative, all highlighted in green.

Table 6-7 Frequency patterns of kare/kano and are/ano in Edo and Meiji novels
D: dialogue  N: narrative (human reference only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>writer</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kano</th>
<th>are</th>
<th>ano</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yomihon</td>
<td>1766-1825</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edo colloquial novels</td>
<td>1770-1840</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōyō</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimei</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
<td>1890-1</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>●</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki I</td>
<td>1905-8</td>
<td>○</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki II</td>
<td>1909-16</td>
<td>●</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O: 5-49 tokens. ●: 50-99 tokens. ●: over 100 tokens. * kanojo

Among the Meiji writers, Shōyō and Futabatei have a pattern of use similar to that in Edo colloquial fiction. Shōyō, who stressed the importance of human feelings in modern novels in his literary criticism, Shosetsu Shinzui (The Essence of the Novel, 1885), suggested the Edo genre of ninjōbon (books of human feelings) as a model for modern fiction, which is demonstrated by unusually high percentage of dialogue in his shosei (see Table 6-6). Futabatei, whose novel Ukigumo (1887) is considered to be the first modern Japanese novel written in a colloquial style, is said to have studied the transcription of ninjō banashi (human nature stories) told by Enchō (an Edo/Meiji storyteller). Thus, the influence of Edo colloquial fiction on these writers is evident in their use of pronouns among many other features. By comparison, Ogai’s novels have a pattern similar to that in yomihon, with kare and kano in both dialogue and narrative, and no token of are and ano. In short, as far as 3PPs are concerned, it is evident where the sources of these Meiji writers’ inspirations lie.

However, Soseki’s use of these pronouns shows a different pattern. In the first period (1905-08), the only personal pronoun appearing with some regularity is kare in narrative at 17, and a small number of tokens of are and ano mainly in dialogue. In the second period (1909-16), the frequency of kare in narrative increases dramatically and the frequency of ano in dialogue shows a moderate increase. Perhaps, the most notable change is the first appearances of kanojo at a very high frequency (130 tokens), while other use of kano is not found. Are for human reference has also disappeared in this period. As a whole, Soseki’s use of 3PPs does
not seem to conform to any of the other patterns seen in Table 6-7. This point will be further investigated in section 6.4.2.

Though the use of pronouns is by no means the only feature to comprise a writing style, it clearly shows a distinctive pattern within each genre of novel investigated in this section. Especially in the Edo period when each genre of fiction had distinctive form (colour of the cover, size and volume of the book, and use of illustrations), content (comic stories, moral tales, etc.) and readership (the intellectuals, merchants, children, women, etc.), the patterns of pronoun use in each genre were consistent and without exceptions as Table 6-7 well illustrates. In fact, it is possible to guess which genre a novel belongs to by just looking at the 3PP use. This can also apply to early Meiji writers works. The creative process of a new narrative style and its sources can be traced through the investigation of 3PPs and seemingly sudden changes in the Meiji period were a part of ongoing changes continued from the Edo period.

6.4 Relationship between 3PPs and narrative styles

The relationships between genres of fiction and 3PP use, and the issue of continuity from Edo fiction to Meiji fiction have been explored in the previous section. This section focuses on Meiji writers and investigates their 3PP use in narrative.

6.4.1 Tsubouchi Shōyō and Futabatei Shimei

The first experimental modern novel, Shōyō’s Shosei, uses are/ano in dialogue and kano in narrative. This pattern is identical to that of the Edo colloquial novels. Shōyō’s Shōsetsu shinzui (1885) is the first modern literary criticism written by a Japanese and he is credited for his effort to free Japanese literature from its moralistic view of the good vs. the evil rooted in Confucianism. According to Fujii (1993: 11-12), Shōyō stressed “two imperatives – to portray human emotions skillfully and develop a written language adequate to the task of presenting these feelings in a realistic manner”. Shōyō argued that Edo popular novels fell short of achieving these goals. In spite of this negative assessment of Edo fiction, his novel remains very much within the confines of Edo fiction from the point of view of 3PP
use.

He was successful in his depiction of students’ colloquial speech in the 1880s in *Shosei*, but had difficulty in writing narrative and often took refuge in noun ending and in long continuous flows of narrative without clear endings. In Japanese writing, not only the pronoun system but also the sentence endings are closely linked to honorific and social markers as well as to other functions such as tense. The honorific quality of the sentence ending reflects the relationship between the speaker and the listener, and that between the speaker and the referent, as well as the status of the referent. This is why it is possible to identify referents even when they do not appear overtly in the sentence. By using a noun ending, Shōyō was able to avoid the use of honorific and social makers and long sentences allowed him to use subject, object or topic referents less frequently. In other words, he did not tackle the real problem of modern narrative writing: 3PPs and sentence endings.

Futabatei Shimeī’s *Ukigumo* (1887) follows a similar pattern of 3PP use to that of Shōyō’s, but without *kano*. *Are/ano* only appear in dialogue and very occasionally in the monologue of the main protagonist. Otherwise, there is no 3PP as such and proper names are the general terms of reference in the narrative part of *Ukigumo*. This is identical to the pattern of pronoun use in *sharebon* and *kokkeibon* (both are Edo colloquial novels). In other words, as far as pronoun use is concerned, the first two pioneering *genbunitchi* (colloquial style) novels, *Shosei* and *Ukigumo*, of the Meiji period are not very far removed from the Edo oral tradition.

The real innovation of Futabatei lies not in his pronoun use but in his use of sentence endings (see 4.5 in Chapter 4 for sentence endings). In Part I of *Ukigumo*, he seems to have adopted traditional narrative writing as Shōyō did, but it is in Part II where he begins to use the *ta*-ending (roughly, a past tense marker) with some regularity in narrative. The *ta*-ending, in Futabatei’s day, was considered to be an informal ending and somewhat abrupt. He used this form to create “a narrative position minus the markers that would signal the relative social standing of author” (Fujii 1993:59), rather than using more polite endings such as *masu* and *dearimasu* as did his

---

3 Noguchi (1994) considers –*ta* ending as a person marker and Komori (1986) considers it as fictional narrative mode.
contemporaries such as Bimyō and Saganoya. In a sense, a very colloquial ta was promoted as a tool for a more neutral and objective narrative.

However, Futabatei’s decision to write with plain sentence endings was not without problems. Short sentences with uniform endings and without much honorific value were potentially a source of confusion and hence, the need for a more explicit appearance of the referent occurred (Noguchi 1994). Although Futabatei managed to create an objective third person narration for the first time in Japanese literature with the introduction of the ta-ending, this change did not bring an instant increase in the use of 3PPs in his writing. This was because Ukigumo consists largely of dialogue and monologue and also because Futabatei’s use of the ta-ending is not as extensive as some scholars claim it to be. The majority of sentences in narrative is written in the present tense with a plain infinitive form and with only occasional ta-endings, or with noun endings, and often stretch over several lines. The latter feature is under the influence of old Edo colloquial novels. The exceptions are the last two Parts, which show Futabatei’s innovation in narrative writing and his potential to become a great modern colloquial narrative writer (see section 4.6.2).

Table 6-8 shows the percentages of the ta-endings in the narrative parts of Ukigumo and Aibiki (Futabatei’s translation of Turgenev’s The Tryst, 1852). Part I of Ukigumo has only 8% of ta-endings, while Part II has 39% and Part III 25%. However, these figures are far smaller than those in his translation, Aibiki (1888), with 78%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
<th>Ta-ending sentences</th>
<th>% of ta-ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukigumo 1887</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>25,216</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>28,133</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>24,953</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aibiki 1888</td>
<td>6,730</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One factor that prevented Futabatei from becoming a great modern Japanese novelist was his limited use of 3PPs, especially the kare type. As Table 6-6 (p. 120) illustrates, he never did use kare in Ukigumo and his later works such as Sono omokage (That
Image, 1906) and Heibon (The Ordinary Person, 1907) do not have any kare either⁴. Even in Aibiki, which has a high proportion of the ta-ending, kare does not appear at all. It seems as though he created a new narrative writing style with colloquial sentence endings but did not adopt a new type of 3PP to go with it, because it was not part of colloquial vocabulary. In other words, he was able to neutralize sentence endings with ta, but stuck with the deictic 3PPs that are far from neutral. This could be the reason why he was dissatisfied with Ukigumo and abandoned literary writing for the following two decades.

6.4.2 Mori Ogai and Natsume Soseki

Ogai’s German trilogy, written in gikobun (elegant formal style), has a striking similarity to yomihon in its extensive use of kare/kano and absence of are/ano. As in yomihon, the dialogue of the German trilogy is written in a formal style and woven into the narrative. The difference is Ogai’s trilogy has quotation marks. While placing a modern young Japanese on foreign soil as a narrator of each of the trilogy, Ogai resorted to an old-fashioned form (the gikobun style) to deliver the story. In this sense, there is a discrepancy between the form and the content of Ogai’s German trilogy. The inability to create an appropriate form to contain a modern subject could have been one of the reasons why Ogai stopped writing novels soon after the trilogy was written. Like Futabatei he remained silent for 18 years before starting to write novels again, this time in a colloquial writing style.

Modernization, triggered by the contact with the West, is often suggested as the main factor of the creation of the modern Japanese narrative writing style. This may have some truth, but in the field of literature, early writers of Meiji fiction also looked back and searched for clues in Edo fiction that could be usefully adopted for modern novels depicting lives of modern individuals. In the cases of Shōyō and Futabatei, the model was Edo colloquial novels, and in the case of Ogai, Edo formal novels. The similar patterns in the use of kare/are and kano/ano shown in Table 6-7 demonstrate the strong connection between these Meiji novels and Edo fiction.

By comparison, Soseki’s use of kare/kano and are/ano is very different. In addition,

⁴ Sono omokage has one token of 彼 and Heibon one token of 彼女. But without annotations, they are both likely to be read as are rather than kare and kanojo respectively.
his writing shows a dramatic change between the first half and the last half of his career. The combination of *kare* and *ano* and the frequent use of *kanojo* in the latter half are unlike any of the patterns depicted in Edo fiction or in the work of his Meiji predecessors shown in Table 6-7. Previously, the combinations that occurred were either *are/ano* in colloquial novels or *kare/kano* in formal writing. In Soseki’s novels, *kano* (except in the form of a compound *kanojo*) and *are* have almost disappeared from third person references; instead, *kare* is used predominantly in narrative with high frequency and *ano* mainly in dialogue with a small proportion in narrative. This shift of *kare*, from its exclusive use in formal novels in the Edo period to its frequent appearances in colloquial novels in the Meiji period, is the focus of the following section.

6.5 *Kare* from formal to colloquial writing

This section follows the use of *kare* in various types of writing to identify the process of its shift from formal to colloquial in the Meiji period.

6.5.1 *Kare* in novels

*Kare* already had a high frequency in Ogai’s trilogy written 15 years before Soseki’s first novel (1905) (see Table 6-6). However, Ogai’s trilogy was written in a formal style that followed the Edo tradition and the similarity of the two (Ogai’s writing and Edo *yomihon*) is evident in the identical pattern of pronoun use shown in Table 6-7. It was a natural progression to have an increased frequency of *kare* in a formal style of writing because of the long historical association between this pronoun and this style. On the other hand, Soseki’s 13 novels are all written in a colloquial style. As evidenced in Edo fiction and the absence of *kare* in the two early modern colloquial novels, *Shosei* (1885) and *Ukigumo* (1887), *kare* and colloquial writing were mutually exclusive. So the shift from the frequent use of *kare* in Ogai’s formal writing to that in Soseki’s colloquial writing was not straightforward.

When Ogai was writing in the early 1890s, although Shōyō and Fubataei had already written novels in colloquial Japanese before him, colloquial writing was not widely accepted. When, following *Ukigumo*, Fubataei translated Turgenev’s two
short stories in a colloquial style in 1888, these had a stronger impact as an eye-opening experience on young aspiring writers such as Tayama Katai, Kunikida Doppo and Shimazaki Tòson than had *Ukigumo* (Yamamoto 1977: 328). As Table 6-8 shows, Futabatei’s translation, *Aibiki* (1888), has much higher proportion of the *ta-* ending in narrative. In this sense, he was more adventurous in his translation than in his creative writing. However, there were people like Saito Ryokuu (1889) who felt there was something unnatural about Futabatei’s writing. Either way, it shows that Futabatei’s writing was received as different and new. Futabatei himself described his own writing in somewhat contradictory terms: “gehin dewa aruga, shikashi poetikaru (vulgar but poetical)” (1971[1906]: 111). Indeed, this comment well illustrates his dilemma — of how to write a colloquial novel without falling into what was then perceived as vulgarity. With the existence of formal writing (*kanbun*: Chinese style writing) as an intellectual and respected style, the colloquial writing style was synonymous with the vulgar and the uneducated in the early Meiji period.

Furthermore, the success of Futabatei’s translations of Turgenev’s stories over *Ukigumo* suggests that readers found it easier to accept experimental writing in translation rather than in original novels, presumably because of the physical and psychological detachment between the writer/reader and the subject matter, which gave a comfortable distance between the two and made the colloquial narrative acceptable. Doppo’s *Musashino* (1901), which was inspired by Futabatei’s *Aibiki*, has the same sense of remoteness or feeling of being removed from everyday living, even though it is set in Japan. It seems that colloquial writing needed time to permeate Japanese society to gain respect, before it was accepted and naturalized. Literature alone could not have achieved this.

### 6.5.2 Kare in other texts

The fifteen-year-gap between Ogai’s German trilogy and Soseki’s first novel, *Wagahai wa neko dearu* (1905), holds significance. Apart from the government’s concerted effort to promote the Tokyo dialect as standard colloquial speech, a number of crucial publications concerning colloquial writing were released during these years. There are three major events contributing to the spread of colloquial writing. The first is the comprehensive translation of *The Old Testament* in plain *wabun* (Japanese style writing) in 1887 and its growing readership in the 1890s. The
second is the release of Gakkōrei (School Law, 1886) and the subsequent resurgence of colloquial writing in textbooks, which had been abandoned since the proclamation of Kaisei kyōikurei (Revised Education Law 1880). And the third is the popularity of Morita Shiken as a translator and the particular style of writing, shūmitsutai (source-text-oriented translation), recreated by him\(^5\) in the late 1880s to 1890s.

All of the above texts have high frequencies of *kare*. For instance, in Chapter 28 of *The Gospel According to Matthew*, *kare* appears 78 times for the translation of *he*, *him* and *his* (Morioka 1999: 163). One of the members of the Bible translation committee, Hepburn, wrote in his letter that the Japanese translation was based on the existing Chinese translation of the Bible and the method was “to insert case particles and verb inflections between Chinese characters” (Hepburn quoted in Morioka 1969: 190). This method, known as *kanbun kondoku*, had been used for reading Chinese texts for many centuries in Japan (see section 3.8 in Chapter 3). In this way, many terms that had already been in the Chinese Bible were directly transferred into the Japanese Bible. This corresponds to Li’s (2002) theory of the frequent use of *kare* in Edo yomihon as interference from Chinese *baihua* novels through translation (see 6.3.2).

Similarly, there were many primers available to accompany foreign language textbooks between 1885 and 1889. Further, some of the popular ones were continually reprinted until about 1905. These contain unusually high numbers of pronouns since most employed word-for-word translation. Table 6-9 shows the method used in many of these books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>love</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>rob</th>
<th>the</th>
<th>nests</th>
<th>of</th>
<th>birds.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1小倉</td>
<td>7好木</td>
<td>6ベク</td>
<td>5奪フ</td>
<td>定冠詞</td>
<td>4巢ヲ</td>
<td>3ノ</td>
<td>2鳥</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1kodomoga 7konomu 6baku 5ubau leikanshi (definite article) 4suo 3no 2 tori.)


---

\(^5\) Before Morita Shiken, most foreign novels were translated in *kanbun kondoku* (Chinese style) writing with liberal editing and summarizing. Shiken, with his journalistic background and belief in source-text-oriented translation, used a translation style called *shūmitsutai*, which, while certainly a departure from the formal *kanbun kondoku* style, was not colloquial either. However, this style was not completely new. During the Edo period, Dutch-Japanese translators based in Nagasaki had already been using it for their translations (Kaganoi 2002).
Underneath each English word, a corresponding Japanese word is placed with a number. The numbers indicate the order of which students should follow when reading the Japanese part: 1kodomoga 2tori 3no 4suou 5ubau 6beku 7konomu. This method is called *chokuyaku* (direct translation). It does not flow naturally as Japanese but was useful in understanding the structure of the original text. Also it was relatively easy for students to follow the numbering system because they were used to it in their study of *kanbun kundoku* (Japanese reading of Chinese texts), which has the same kind of numbering system and had been the basis of intellectual pursuit ever since the arrival of Chinese texts in Japan. This method of reading Western texts in Japanese according to the numbers is called *obun kundoku*, as distinct from *kanbun kundoku*, and was more highly regarded than semantic translation (Kamei 2002: 3). However, it was not new to the Meiji period and had already been employed by translators of Dutch-Japanese in Nagasaki in the late 17th century. In other words, the same method of reading foreign texts has been applied to Chinese, Dutch and then English over a period of 15 centuries. It shows the strength and long-lasting nature of *kundoku* method in Japanese translation and language practice.

The following example demonstrates how *kare* is frequently used in *obun kundoku* as a result of this *chokuyaku* method. Example (3) is a sentence from one of the primers mentioned previously, “Sōchū i yaku New National daiyō tokuhon chokuyaku kōgi” (Direct Translation and Detailed Guide for New National Reader, Wada Masao trans. 1900).

(5) **His** strength is so enormous that **he** can crush the skull of an ox with a single blow of **his** powerful paw, and then grasp it **with** **his** jaws and bound away.

*Kare* no tsuyosa wa *kare* ga *kare* no kyōryokunaru maashi no ichigeki o motte oushin no zukotsu o oshikudaki sorekare *kare* no kuchi ni oite sore o tsukami shikashite tobisari ataru koto hodo sayō ni kyodai dearu. (Source: Morioka 1999: 162)

Every **he** and **his** in the original English is translated into Japanese with *kare*. This kind of translation is typical of *chokuyaku* (direct translation) practised by primer writers of this period and was read by many young learners of foreign languages. Later on, this style was adopted in Government Japanese textbooks: “Jinjō shōgaku tokuhon” (The Standard Primary School Reader) was first published in 1903, two years before the publication of Soseki’s first novel. This shows that the style created
through *chokuyaku* (direct translation) in foreign language primers was absorbed into Japanese writing.

In the area of literary translation, the late 1880s and 1890s were the height of Morita Shiken’s popularity. He was dubbed “king of translation” (Kato 1991) and, as mentioned above, practised source-text-oriented translation (Kato & Maruyama 1991). In his translations, he attempted to create a style as close to the original structure of the source text as possible. Another translator, Fujita Mokichi (1887), also states that he tried to retain as many original features as possible and to achieve this he consciously broke minor grammar rules of Japanese and felt justified in doing so. His statement is a reflection of the common attitude towards translation at the time. Futabatei Shimei (1971 [1908]: 114) went further and wrote that he tried to retain “every single comma and every single period” of the original text, although ten years later he was of a different opinion.

As was the case for the English primers, the practice of word-for-word translation of the time must have resulted in some kinds of interference from source texts that were mainly in English. According to my calculation, Shiken’s translation of Victor Hugo’s “Choses Vues”, *Tantei Yūberu*, (1885) contains 548 tokens of *kare* per 100,000 characters – this figure is much higher than those in Japanese writing (in which *kare* seldom appears) of the time and almost as high as those of Soseki’s later novels; the work, however, appeared 25 years earlier. In his afterword to *Tantei Yūberu*, Shiken complains of the serious lack of equivalent Japanese terms to the English from which he was translating and confesses that he had to rely on many Chinese terms and characters to compensate for this. As in Bible translation, Chinese played a crucial role in Shiken’s translation of Western novels.

Apart from the publication of language primers and translations, colloquial writing was gradually becoming mainstream. Ozaki Köyō, who was at first strongly against colloquial writing in the 1880s, succumbed to it in 1892 and wrote a colloquial novel, *Tajō taken* (1896). This novel was so successful that it triggered the revival of colloquial novels, which had been losing ground for some time since Futabatei’s *Ukigumo*. *Tajō taken* contains 252 tokens of *kare* (Okumura 1954: 69) in 333 pages.
As these examples show, *kare* and colloquial writing were gaining their presence in various types of publication via translation and creative writing. Young Japanese were growing up absorbing these forms of writing on a daily basis at school and at home and over time it became natural for them to read and write in this way. This change took place during the 15 years between Ogai’s first novel and Soseki’s first.

Thus, the foundation for colloquial writing and the use of *kare* had been laid before the arrival of Soseki on the literary scene. Luckily for Soseki, the time was ripe and the readers were ready to accept a modern novel written in a colloquial style without much resistance and reservation.

### 6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has followed the changing use of *kare/kano* and *are/ano* as these appeared in Edo and Meiji novels. In Edo fiction, two distinctive patterns of use surfaced. These patterns are also represented by two distinctive genres of fiction. One is a group of popular colloquial novels such as *sharebon*, *kokkeibon* and *ninjōbon*, in which *are* and *ano* are used exclusively in dialogue, *kano* appears sparsely in narrative, and *kare* is absent altogether. The other genre is the formal narrative *yomihon*, in which *kare* and *kano* appear in both dialogue and narrative, and *are* and *ano* are absent. In other words, *are/ano* were generally associated with colloquial writing and dialogue, and *kare/kano* with formal writing and narrative.

In the Meiji period, while Ogai’s novels written in a formal style show higher frequencies of *kare/kano* and have an identical pattern of 3PP use to that of *yomihon*, the first two pioneering modern colloquial novels, *Shosei* and *Ukigumo* have a pattern of 3PP use similar to the Edo colloquial novels, which hardly feature *kare/kano* at all. Of the four writers (Shōyō, Shimei, Ogai and Soseki), it is Soseki, in his colloquial novels, who uses *kare* most frequently, showing a hybrid pattern of 3PP use.

What becomes obvious from my investigations in this chapter is the strong
connection between the \textit{kare} 3PPs and the narrative part of Meiji novels examined here — the frequency increase of the \textit{kare} 3PPs occurred in Narrative.

\textit{Kare}, used more frequently in Edo formal fiction, was adopted in Soseki's colloquial novels at an even higher frequency. A number of factors that made this shift possible are the common use of \textit{chokuyaku} (direct translation) in foreign language primers, the popularity of source-text-oriented translation, the government promotion of colloquial speech and writing, and the arrival of a new generation of readers who were becoming accustomed to a new style of writing through their education and reading.

There is no denying that contact with the West played a significant role in the Meiji period. However, my investigation shows that the change in 3PP use did not happen simply because of Western contact. The long tradition of contact with Chinese, translations of Chinese stories, and translations from Dutch had laid the foundation for the change. Western influence was only one of the several factors that together generated change, and contributed to the general increase of \textit{kare} in modern novels. The particular significance of Soseki lies in the way he extracted the essence of \textit{kanbun}, translation and English, and then skillfully combined these to create a modern colloquial writing reflected in his use of the \textit{kare} 3PPs.
Chapter 7

Referents of *kare*

7.1 Introduction

The tendency for *kare* 3PPs to appear in the narrative part of Soseki’s novels has been identified in Chapter 6. However, they do not feature frequently in the first half of his novels. It appears as though there was a sudden leap in frequency between *Sanshiro* (SAN, 1908) and *Sorekara* (SORE, 1909). The average frequency of the *kare* 3PPs per 100,000 characters in his novels written between 1905 and 1908 is only 17 – the equivalent of 30 tokens per novel (approximately one in every ten pages), while that of his novels between 1909 and 1916 is 469 – 832 per novel (approximately three per page). This chapter sets out to investigate factors behind this dramatic and sudden increase in frequency.

The chapter focuses on two aspects of pronoun use – referents and particles. The former involves a historical investigation of the referents of *kare* in relation to those of *are* from the late Edo to the Meiji period. The latter follows the frequency change of particles that collocate with the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s novels in comparison to those that collocate with personal names. For a theoretical background, the theory of grammaticalization (Hopper and Traugott 2003) is applied in order to understand the process of change from the universal point of view rather than the culturally specific point of view related to honorifics in Japanese.

The first investigation of referents reveals the expanding territory of *kare* at the expense of *are*. The second investigation reveals that rather than creating a new function, the *kare* 3PPs appear to be replacing existing terms that function as 3PPs, such as personal names. These two factors are identified as contributors to the 3PP frequency increase in Soseki’s novels.
7.2 Grammaticalization (generalization and specialization)

7.2.1 Different stages of grammaticalization

In this thesis, ‘grammaticalization’ is understood in a broad sense “as change that gives rise to new grammatical categories” (Kiparsky 2004), in this case, a new pronominal category, the *kare* 3PPs. Since detailed explanation of grammaticalization has been given in Chapter 2, I will avoid repeating it and give only a summary of particular aspects that are important in this chapter.

Hopper and Traugott (2003: 116) described grammaticalization “as viewed from the diachronic perspective is (...) a unidirectional phenomenon”. This aspect of ‘unidirectionality’ indicates that grammaticalization has a tendency to move in one direction but not in reverse. Normally, its direction is from a lexical item to a grammatical one, then to a clitic and finally an inflectional affix in the history of individual forms in many languages. This tendency to follow a particular pattern of change is called a ‘cline’, and is as shown below (pp. 6-16).

![Content item → grammatical word → clitic → inflectional affix](chart)

The process of grammaticalization involves several stages such as:

- Generalization
- Specialization
- Increase in grammatical status
- Renewal

*Generalization* is the stage of lexical items taking on grammatical functions, being generalized, coming to be used in more and more contexts and eventually gaining wider distribution and meanings (p. 102). *Specialization* is a process in which, as certain items become generalized in meaning and use, other forms in the same category become less frequently used and may even fall into disuse and disappear totally from speech or writing (p. 115). These two processes occur simultaneously and ensure the ‘increase in
grammatical status' of the generalized item. Finally as these generalized items become unmarked and lose their novelty, they could be renewed "as more expressive ways are found of saying the same thing" (p. 116). This is called renewal or reanalysis and a new cycle of grammaticalization continues with the new items. Thus, "grammaticalization tends to be a process of replacing older grammatical categories with newer ones having the same approximate value" (p. 23).

In this process, quite often, old items persist for a long period of time alongside newer items and lead to coexistence, which Hopper (1991: 22) called layering. In other words, layering is the synchronic result of ongoing grammaticalization of multiple items within one functional domain. The coexistence of the kare 3PPs and ko-so-a 3PPs is an example. This layering may continue for a while, but eventually more frequently used ones gradually replace the other less used ones and become the standard items in their own domains. Therefore, frequency is the key evidence for the different stages of grammaticalization (Hopper & Traugott 2003: 127).

7.2.2 Frequency effects
There are two kinds of frequency, token frequency and type frequency. Tokens are individual occurrences of any word form or sound and types are the number of different word forms that are available to a particular class or function. Token frequency indicates how many times a particular word or phrase is used and type frequency how many varieties of co-occurring items a particular word or phrase has in a corpus. High frequencies in both token and type demonstrate more widespread and general use.

The importance of frequency in grammaticalization has been well documented by a number of scholars (e.g. Schuchardt 1885, Fidelholtz 1975, Hooper 1976, Bybee and Scheibman 1999, Bybee 2001). Bybee (2006: 5-6) summarises the effects of token frequency in three major points: reduction¹, conservation and autonomy. Reduction effect is the tendency of high frequency words and phrases to undergo phonetic/formal

¹ Bybee uses 'the reducing effect' and 'the conserving effect' instead of 'reduction' and 'conservation'. The latter terms are used in Hopper and Traugott (2003), which I have adopted here.
reduction at a faster rate than low and mid frequency items. Examples (1) and (2) illustrate this type.

(1) I am going to → I’m gonna
(2) I don’t know → I dunno

As a result of reduction, when a term or phrase is shortened to become a clitic or an affix, the original form may remain as an autonomous element and undergo a different kind of change. Similarly, “existing forms take on new meanings in certain contexts, while retaining old meanings in other contexts” (Hopper 1991: 122). These split meanings and functions of the same term and different paths they follow are called divergence (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 118) or split (Heine and Reh 1984: 57-9).

Conservation effect relates to the fact that frequently used terms or units are more likely to retain their forms than infrequent ones. This is, for example, observed in the retention of irregular verbs. While less frequently used irregular verbs, such as chide/chid and kneel/knelt, appear to be in the process of conforming to the paradigm of regular verbs (chided and kneeled), the high frequency irregular verbs, such as go/went, come/came and have/had, retain their irregular forms. Thus “frequency strengthens the memory representations of words or phrase” (Bybee 2004: 5) and resists erosion.

The third effect, autonomy, “refers to the fact that morphologically complex forms (or strings of words) of high frequency can lose their internal structure as they become autonomous from etymologically related forms” (Bybee 2005: 6). The use of French ‘pas’ independent of its partner, ‘ne’ is an example of this.

While it is difficult to specify the absolute frequency ranges for each phenomenon, there is no dispute regarding the importance of frequency as a key indicator of grammaticalization and language change. For this reason, this study regards the frequency as a vital tool for the investigation and analysis of pronoun change.
This chapter will apply the theory of grammaticalization to the diachronic change of kare from the Edo to Meiji period. It focuses on the specialization of kare from a multi-purpose pronoun to a male singular 3PP and of are from both human and non-human 3PP to a non-human 3PP. It also demonstrates the broadening process of the kare referent from very specific to more general ('generalization').

7.3 Referents of kare and are through history

7.3.1 Edo fiction

In present day grammar kare is normally classified as a 3PP for human reference only and are as a demonstrative pronoun for non-human reference. However, this has not always been the case: in Edo literature both kare and are functioned as 3PPs as well as demonstrative pronouns referring to both human and non-human referents. Li (2002: 421) notes 36 tokens of are in a kokkeibon (comic tales of the Edo period), Tōkai dōchū hizakurige Chapters 1-5 (1801), of which 11 refer to humans. The ratio of human to non-human referents is 1:2, showing the predominant use of are for non-human reference. However, my investigation of the whole text of the same book demonstrates an almost equal distribution of are for human and non-human referents (see Table 7-1). Li also notes that, in Edo literature, kare referred to both human and non-human. These observations suggest that sometime between 1800 and the present, the specialization of are for non-human and kare for human reference must have occurred.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Length (characters)</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Non-human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Tōkai dōchū hizakurige</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1801</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Ukiyoburo</td>
<td>122,880</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Harutsugedori (ninjōbon)</td>
<td>112,200</td>
<td>1836</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-1 Referents of are in Edo colloquial fiction (raw figures)

Table 7-1 shows two referent types (human and non-human) of are and their tokens in Edo colloquial novels in which are predominantly appears. The figures indicate that are was used almost equally for both human and non-human referents in this genre in the middle to late Edo period, and does not show any conclusive leaning towards either of the referent types. However, Li (2002: 420) notes that the ratio of human to non-human
reference of *are* was wider in the transcriptions of colloquial storytelling (*kobanashi*) in the late Edo period, at 1:6. This suggests that the specialization of *are* for non-human reference was underway in storytelling ahead of colloquial writing.

Table 7-2 shows two referent types of *kare* (human and non-human) and their tokens in Edo *yomihon* (formal text-based novels), in which *kare* predominately appears. D (*Nishiyama monogatari*, 1767), E (*Ugetsu monogatari*, 1777) and F (*Chûhongata yomihon*, 1799-1810) have tokens of *kare* used for both human and non-human referents, although the frequencies of the latter are much smaller than those of the former. There is no token of *kare* for non-human reference in F (*Kinseisetsu bishōnen roku*, 1842). These figures suggest that the use of non-human *kare* was decreasing and that, by the end of the Edo period, *kare* was almost exclusively used for human reference in *yomihon*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Length</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Non-human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D <em>Nishiyama monogatari</em></td>
<td>25,792</td>
<td>1767</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E <em>Ugetsu monogatari</em></td>
<td>48,794</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F <em>Chûhongata yomihon</em></td>
<td>128,928</td>
<td>1799-1810</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G <em>Kinseisetsu bishōnen roku</em></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A collection of short *yomihon* stories.*

In summary, in the late 18th century, *are* and *kare* are used for both human and non-human reference. However, by the mid 19th century, *kare* became specialised for human reference, while *are* was still used more or less equally for both. Thus by the end of the Edo period the specialization of *kare* as the 3PP for human reference was almost complete, but that of *are* for non-human reference was not. The following section will investigate the further progress of these two pronouns in the Meiji period (1868-1912) that followed the Edo period.

7. 3. 2 Meiji fiction

In order to trace further the respective specializations of *kare* and *are* for human and non-human reference, works of four Meiji writers, Tsubouchi Shōyō, Futabatei Shimei, Mori Ogai and Natsume Soseki, are investigated. Table 7-3 shows the number of tokens
of *kare* and *are* referents in selected Meiji writers’ novels in a chronological order. It displays that Shōyō uses *are* more for human than non-human reference, while Shimeī’s use of *are* shows equal distributions. Ogai’s novels do not have *are* at all. Soseki uses *are* for more non-human than human reference, indicating declining use of *are* for human reference. By comparison, he uses *kare* exclusively for human (over 1,000 tokens), demonstrating a further stage of the specialization that was already underway in the late Edo novels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Non-human</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Non-human</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shōyō</td>
<td>Tōsei shōsei katagi</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimeī</td>
<td>Ukiyume</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
<td>German trilogy</td>
<td>1890-1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki</td>
<td>London shōsoku</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanshirō</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michikusa</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Li (2002: 400-431) suggests that *kare* became established as the main 3PP for human reference during the 1890s, while *are* retreated to non-human reference and in the process acquired a nuance of impoliteness when used for human. His argument is supported by the fact that *Tōsei shōsei katagi* and *Ukiyume*, which were written in the 1880s, have larger or equal tokens of human use to non-human use of *are* but Soseki’s novels, which were written after 1900 have fewer tokens of human reference of *are* and no token of non-human reference of *kare*. It is fair to say that the specialization of *kare* to human was complete in Soseki’s novels but that of *are* to non-human reference was not.

### 7.4 Referents of *kare* 3PPs in narrative

#### 7.4.1 Variety of *kare* 3PP referents

The previous section demonstrated the specializing process of *kare* for human and *are* for non-human reference. This section will further investigate the referents of the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s novels to capture the broadening process (generalization) of *kare* referents within human reference. For the investigation, the computer-generated tokens
of the *kare* 3PPs are manually categorised according to referent types and compared with their token frequencies to determine if there is any connection between the change in referents and the frequency increase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referent numbers (person)</th>
<th>3PP frequencies (/100k characters)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>novel</strong></td>
<td><strong>kare</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTC</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUBI</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFU</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOJI</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOKO</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-4 shows the number of characters that each of the *kare* 3PPs (*kare*, *kanojo* and *karera*) refers to in the narrative part of Soseki’s novels (on the left) and the 3PP frequencies per 100,000 characters (on the right). NEKO is excluded from the investigation since the narrator of the novel is a cat, bringing in a different perspective from human to human interaction. The first five novels show smaller numbers of referents of the *kare* 3PPs than the later ones. The one exception is KUSA, which has 14 different characters who are referred to as *kare*, *karera*, or *kanojo*. Its frequency of the *kare* 3PPs at 33, is much higher than those of other Soseki’s novels written just before and after KUSA (only two tokens in BOTC, five in GUBI, ten in KOFU and nine in SAN), and reflects the variety of referents. The referent number increases in SORE to 18 and with some ups and downs finally reaches 60 in MEI, indicating the broadening reference of the *kare* 3PPs. The 3PP frequencies show a similar pattern of change, with a dramatic increase in SORE (from only nine in SAN to 210) and a noticeable decrease in KOKO (from 352 in KOJI to 208). MICH has the highest frequency of the *kare* 3PPs out of all Soseki’s novels, although its referent number is not the highest. This is due to the exceptionally high frequency of *kare* at 1055. As this demonstrates, the increases in *kare* and *kanojo* referents contribute to the frequency increase more than the *karera* referents.
So far, the increased frequency of the *kare* 3PPs seems to be related to the increase in referent variety in Soseki’s novels. In other words, more and more characters in his novels began to be referred to as *kare, karera* or *kanojo*, who would have previously been referred to by their names or some other forms of third person reference. This occurred halfway through his career (and will be further investigated in section 7.5.2). However, more investigation is also needed to find out how the *kare* 3PPs have expanded their referent range and types, and this will be the focus of the following section.

### 7.4.2 Qualitative analysis of referents

1. **First person narrators and 3PP referents**

In Soseki’s early novels, the *kare* 3PPs are certainly not used to refer to just anyone; there seems to be a pattern in his choice of the referents. To extract the pattern, the referents of the *kare* 3PPs are categorized into three groups according to the physical and psychological proximity (familiarity/distance) from the narrator in his first person novels, BOTC, KUSA, KOFU, HIGA, KOJI and KOKO. HIGA consists of parts written in the first person and third person. The figures shown in Table 7-5 are from the part written in the first person only. Similarly, the part written in KOJI as a letter by Mr. H, who is not the main narrator, is excluded. The groups are: a) family members, b) friends & relatives and c) others, and the tokens are manually sorted accordingly as shown in Table 7-5. The aim is to find out if the familiarity of the characters to the narrator influences the use of the *kare* 3PPs.

Table 7-5 shows a clear pattern of change in the referents of the *kare* 3PPs. In all three sub-categories (*kare, kanojo* and *karera*), the *kare* 3PPs are first used to refer to the c) group that is the most distant from the narrator, then it expands to the b) group and finally in HIGA (1911) to the a) group, moving from the more distant to the familiar. For example, the only token of *kare* in BOTC (1906) refers to a school principal with whom the narrator does not get on, and the *kanojo* in KUSA (1906) refers to camellias (non-human generic reference). In fact, all ten tokens of *karera* in KUSA refer to non-
participating generic characters such as poets and painters, and entrepreneurs, or non-human referents such as theatrical plays and novels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOTC 1906</th>
<th>KUSA 1906</th>
<th>KOFU 1908</th>
<th>HIGA 1911</th>
<th>KOJI 1913</th>
<th>KOKO 1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>kare</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Friends &amp; relatives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>karera</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Friends &amp; relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kanojo</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Friends &amp; relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first four novels do not have the *kare* 3PPs referring to family members. This type of reference has to wait until HIGA in which the narrator, Sunaga, refers to his father as *kare* and his mother as *kanojo*. In KOJI (1913), the narrator, Jirō, refers to all his family members, including his parents, brother, sister, sister-in-law and niece, as *kare*, *kanojo*, or *karera*. KOKO (1914) does not have any tokens of *kare* in the a) group. There are a couple of possible reasons for this: a large part of the novel is written in a letter form, therefore taking a different style, and also one of the two narrators’ families are dead and only appear very briefly. However, *karera* and *kanojo* in this novel do refer to family members.

In summary, the referent range of the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s novels shows a process of expansion (generalization of use) from the unfamiliar to more familiar and intimate territories, and also the expansion of the territories correlates with the frequency increase observed in section 7.4.1.

(2) **Character types and *kare* and *karera***

The previous section investigated the expanding territory of the *kare* 3PPs according to the relationships between the first person narrator(s) and different characters in Soseki’s first person narrative novels. This section will investigate the use of the *kare* 3PPs in relation to the importance of the character in the novel, in addition to the
familiar/unfamiliar distinction investigated in the previous section. Characters in 13 novels are sorted into three groups – the main characters (plural protagonists), the supporting characters and peripheral characters – and all the tokens of *kare* and *karera* are manually separated into these categories in Table 7-6. *Kanojo* will be separately investigated in Chapter 8 because of its late appearance in Soseki's novels. The novel NEKO is also excluded for the same reason mentioned in the previous section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>novel</th>
<th>No. of referents</th>
<th>Tokens of <em>kare</em> and <em>karera</em></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>main characters</td>
<td>supporting characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUBI</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOFU</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOJI</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KOKO</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICH</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1176</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Titles in blue: first person narrative novels.

Table 7-6 shows the following features:

- *kare* and *karera* are sparsely used in the first five novels and mostly refer to supporting and peripheral characters,
- the first regular use of *kare/karera* for main characters is in SORE,
- *kare/karera*’s reference to all three character groups increases, although not to the same extent,
- the frequency increase of *kare* and *karera* is most pronounced in the main characters group, and
- the increase in the number of characters referred to by *kare* and *karera* largely correlates with their frequency increase.

As shown above, the majority of tokens of *kare* and *karera* in Soseki’s early novels refer to the lesser characters rather than the main protagonists. SAN (1908), for instance, has
only one token of *kare* referring to the hero of the story, Sanshirō, while 13 tokens refer to minor characters. However, the situation is changed from SORE (1909) onward; suddenly the main characters are referred to as *kare* and *karera* and increase their frequencies to reach 1176 in MICH (1915) and 1876 in MEI (1916) in less than ten years. This demonstrates the expansion of *kare* and *karera*, which were used only for peripheral and supporting characters in Soseki’s early novels, but for more prominent characters in his later novels. It shows that in addition to the increased referent variety (see 7.4.1), the frequency increase in the main character group contributed to the overall frequency increase of *kare* and *karera*.

This section investigated two aspects of the *kare* 3PP referents: first, the proximity of the referents to the first person narrator; and second, the importance of the referents as characters in the novel. Both investigations show remarkably similar results. In Soseki’s early novels the *kare* 3PPs refer to distant (unfamiliar)/peripheral characters, the change taking place in the middle point of his career, with an expansion of the referent range to include close (familiar)/central characters, and the frequencies of the all referent types keep increasing (excepting in a first person novel, KOKO, a large part of which is written in a letter format) until they hit a peak in MICH (1915). This pattern of change in referents demonstrates a centripetal move: a move from the outside (peripheral characters) towards the inside (central characters).

### 7.4.3 *Kare* in SORE, MICH and MEI

In Soseki’s novels, MICH and MEI have two of the highest frequencies of *kare*. Tanizaki (1959: 58), who was alive when Soseki wrote these novels, indicated that Soseki was under the influence of the Naturalist movement by that time (see 5.3.4). Karatani (1992: 38), on the other hand, claims that Soseki’s autobiographical novel, MICH, is different from the Naturalists’ confessional novels. Japanese Naturalist writers often used *kare* as a thin disguise for *I*, and are referred to as ‘*I*-novelists’. By comparing the uses of *kare* in Soseki’s novels, SORE, MICH and MEI, and its uses in the Naturalists’ novels, the differences will become clear.
Table 7-7 shows the tokens of *kare* in two novels, *Futon* (1907) and *Ippeisotsu* (1908), by Tayama Katai (1871-1930), who was Soseki’s contemporary and an influential figure in the literary circles of the time. Although both novels are very short, they contain 32 and 34 tokens of *kare* respectively. The normalised figures (71 and 296) are extremely high for novels of this time. However, each novel contains three different forms of *kare* (衆, かれ, and 彼) and they appear to be used indiscriminately, indicating a transitional stage with “layering” of multiple forms (Hopper 1991). In addition, all tokens of *kare* in each novel are used for one particular protagonist: Tokio in *Futon* and a soldier in *Ippeisotsu*. In this way, the use of *kare* was closer to that of personal names.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Futon (1907) 45,000 characters</th>
<th>Ippeisotsu (1908) 11,484 characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kare = Tokio</td>
<td>Kare = The Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>群</td>
<td>かれ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>かれ</td>
<td>群</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼</td>
<td>彼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/100k characters</td>
<td>/100k characters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Futon (1907) 45,000 characters</th>
<th>Ippeisotsu (1908) 11,484 characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kare = Tokio</td>
<td>Kare = The Soldier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>群</td>
<td>かれ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>かれ</td>
<td>群</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼</td>
<td>彼</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/100k characters</td>
<td>/100k characters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-8 *Kare in GUBI and SAN*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GUBI (1907) 196,281 characters</th>
<th>SAN (1908) 168,554 characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>帯 (彼)</td>
<td>帯 (彼)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>帯</td>
<td>帯</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ono</td>
<td>Ono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munenoki</td>
<td>Munenoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A foreigner</td>
<td>A foreigner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/100k characters</td>
<td>/100k characters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparison, Soseki’s two novels, GUBI (1907) and SAN (1908), written in the same years as Katai’s two novels, show very different patterns of *kare* use (Table 7-8 above):

- the tokens of *kare* are much smaller than those in Katai’s novels
- only one form, 彼, is used, and
- *kare* has several referents.
These features indicate that, although *kare* the number of tokens is smaller in Soseki’s two novels than in Katai’s, their use is at a more grammaticalised stage than that in Katai’s two novels: *kare* is consolidated to one form (specialisation) and used more generally (generalisation). In other words, Soseki’s *kare* is more neutral, less semantically specific and closer to the English *he*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7-9 Referents of <em>kare</em> in SORE, MICH and MEI (raw figures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SORE (1909)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kare total</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/100k characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke-protagonist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiraoka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke’s father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kadono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seitarō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisuke’s friend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michiyo’s brother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 referents</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Kare* is further grammaticalised in Soseki’s later novels. Table 7-9 shows a diverse range of *kare* referents in SORE (1909), MICH (1915) and MEI (1916). The Table demonstrates the following:

- the variety of referents increases from SORE to MICH and then to MEI, and
- the tokens of *kare* referring to the main protagonist increases accordingly.

These features suggest that by MICH and MEI, Soseki’s *kare* was highly grammaticalised and had acquired very general and neutral characteristics suitable for an objective and transparent form of narrative, which Futabatei attempted in *Ukigumo* (1887) 28 years earlier. Soseki’s use of *kare* also demonstrates that MICH, in spite of its
autobiographical nature, is quite different from the Naturalists’ confessional novels in which *kare* has a very specific use and is almost equal to *I*. This *kare*, specific to the Naturalists, continued to be the mainstream and is seen in novels by later writers such as Shiga Naoya (1883-1971) and Akutagawa Ryūnosuke (1892-1927). This is further examined in Chapter 9.

### 7.5 *Kare* 3PPs and particles

#### 7.5.1 *Kare* 3PPs and particles

The previous sections demonstrated the clear picture of generalization of the *kare* 3PPs with the expansion of their referent range and frequency increase. However, the question remains of how this expansion was actually achieved – whether they acquired a new function or replaced the existing function of other terms? Okumura (1954: 71) hypothesised that “the *kare* 3PPs were introduced into Japanese not to replace something pre-existing but to fill a vacant gap, which was inherent in Japanese, by supplying the subject, possessive, and object, and of these subject filling was their main function”. Contrary to this, Yanabu (1996: 201-3) argues that a language is complete on its own and “*kare* and *kanojo* were brought in as something extra” and were novel to start with, later extending their redundant presence in Japanese. Therefore, according to Yanabu, they are structurally dispensable. Neither of these scholars gives credible data to support his argument. This section will set out to explore how the *kare* 3PPs increased their frequency, focusing on grammatical markers (particles). Particles (sometimes called *postpositions*) are dependent grammatical markers, which normally follow nouns directly, and indicate the case of core and peripheral participants, as well as features such as topicalisation, stress, degree and approximation, etc. This section will examine individual tokens of the *kare* 3PPs and their particles in the narrative part of Soseki’s novels, and try to capture the underlying pattern of their use and the process of their integration into his writing.

For the investigation, the tokens of the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s 13 novels are electronically sorted according to their particles that include case markers. There are many particles
with different functions in Japanese and scholars seem to be divided in their opinion of how to define them, especially *wa* and *ga* (cf. Tsukishima 1980: 147-59). *Wa*, in contemporary grammar, is classified as a topic marker and *ga* as a subject marker. However, human referents in the grammatical role of subject are often presented as topics in Japanese. This leads to nouns or pronouns followed by *wa* being interpreted often as subjects, even though *wa* itself is not a case marker. This seems to be Okumura’s interpretation, too. He gives examples of both ‘*kare + wa*’ and ‘*kare + ga*’ as subjects when he states that the *kare* 3PPs increased their frequency mainly as subject fillers.

It is not the aim of this study to discuss the intricate meanings and functions of these; therefore the categorization of particles here is based on the conventional grammar that regards *wa* as topic, *ga* as subject, *no* as possessive, *o* as direct object and *ni* as indirect object markers, and all the rest are grouped as ‘others’ (cf. Yamada 1936, Hashimoto 1959, Tsukishima 1980, Ōno 2000). Also, *no* does not always function as a possessive – it does also serve to mark the referent that has subject role in a noun-modifying clauses. Tokens of these are separated from the tokens of the possessive *no* and shown in the table below. If Okumura is right, *wa*, *ga* and *no* (subject) should have the highest increase in the collocation with the *kare* 3PPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>neko</th>
<th>botc</th>
<th>kusa</th>
<th>gubi</th>
<th>kofu</th>
<th>san</th>
<th>sora</th>
<th>mon</th>
<th>higa</th>
<th>kogi</th>
<th>koko</th>
<th>mich</th>
<th>mei</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>wa</em> (topic)</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>3358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>no</em> (possessive)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>2141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>no</em> (subject)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ga</em> (subject)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>460</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ni</em> (indirect object)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>o</em> (direct object)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>412</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>2605</td>
<td>7129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7-10 shows the tokens of the *kare* 3PPs according to the particles. The total tokens of the first six particles are 6,717 and amount to 94% of the whole. The topic marker, *wa*, has the highest tokens at 3,358, followed by the possessive, *no*, at 2,141. These two
combined amount to over 77% of the total. Together with the subject markers, no (118 tokens) and ga (460 tokens), the percentage is over 85%. By comparison, the object markers, ni and o, amount to only 9%. The remaining 6% is shared by 37 different particles of which 13 have only one token each. The table clearly shows that in total, wa is the particle that appears most frequently with the kare 3PPs in Soseki’s novels.

Chart 7-A Frequencies of kare 3PPs according to case (/100,000 characters)

For chronological comparison, the raw figures in Table 7-10 are normalised to a ratio of 100,000 orthographic characters because of the different length of the novels and graphically displayed in Chart 7-A. The frequencies of the kare 3PPs in each particle group - topic (wa), possessive (no), subject (ga & no), object (o & ni) and others - in Soseki’s novels are shown in different colours. At about the middle point of Soseki’s career (SORE, 1909), the kare 3PPs start to appear regularly and increase except for a dip in KOJI (1913) and KOKO (1914). These two novels are written in the first person, while all other novels since SAN (1908) are in third person narrative. In each novel except three GUBI (1907), SAN and KOKO, the most frequent particles that follow these pronouns are wa that indicates the topic, followed by no that indicates the possessive, then by the object markers, ni and o and the subject marker ga and no. The other types of particles also show an increase over time. The later novels, especially the
last two novels show much higher frequencies of wa and no particles among the others. This is consistent with the result of the total frequencies in Table 7-10.

Both Table 7-10 and Chart 7-A show that the topic marker, wa, is the most frequent particle that appears with the kare 3PP in Soseki’s novels. These results seem to support the latter half of Okumura’s hypothesis: the kare 3PPs were introduced into Japanese “to supply the subject, possessive, and object, and of these three the subject filling is its main function”, if wa is interpreted as a subject marker as he did. However, to be consistent with the widely accepted definition of wa, it is more appropriate to state that “the kare 3PPs appear most frequently with the topic marker, wa, followed by the possessive marker no and then by the subject markers, ga and no in Soseki’s novels”. Also, the first half of Okumura’s claim, “the kare 3PPs were introduced into Japanese not to replace something pre-existing but to fill a vacant gap”, cannot be proven by these figures. For this, the situation before the regular use of the kare 3PPs has to be examined and compared with the results above. This will be the focus of the following section

7.5.2 Personal names and particles
As Chart 7-A above shows, the first half of Soseki’s novels are almost devoid of the kare 3PPs. Chapter 5 (sections 5.4.2 & 5.4.3) revealed that in these early novels, personal names and common names are often used for terms of reference instead of the 3PPs. But the simple frequency comparison did not show that the kare 3PPs increased at the expense of the personal names. By investigating how these terms are distributed according to the particle type, we may reveal a better picture of the changeover process: whether personal names were displaced by the kare 3PPs or whether the latter have created a new function.

For the comparison, the main protagonists’ names from Soseki’s three third person novels, Sanshirō in SAN, Daisuke in SORE and Kenzō in MICH, are counted and sorted electronically according to the four particle types, wa (a topic marker), no (a possessive marker), ga and no (subject markers) and ni and o (object markers). These are shown in Chart 7-B. Similarly, the tokens of the 3PP, kare, which refer to the same three
protagonists are sorted according to the same particle groups and shown in a reversed format (with minus figures) in Chart 7-C, to make the comparison between the two charts visually easier to comprehend. Each of the three novels marks a pivotal point of the change in Soseki’s use of the *kare* 3PPs: SAN (1908) – the pre-*kare* stage, SORE (1909) – the first regular use, and MICH (1915) – the highest frequency.

Chart 7-B Frequencies of personal names (Sanshirō/Daisuke/Kenzō) according to particles (/100,000 characters)

†Chart 7-C Frequencies of *kare* referring to Sanshirō/Daisuke/Kenzō according to particles (/100,000 characters)

For all three names in Chart 7-B, the topic marker, *wa*, appears most frequently with them, although the frequency of Kenzō is smaller than those of the other two by half. The chart indicates that the majority of the personal names of the main protagonists in Soseki’s third person novels appear with the topic marker, *wa*, and much fewer with the
possessive, object and subject markers in that order. This result is similar to those of the kare 3PPs shown in Chart 7-A in section 7.5.1, except the latter have higher proportion of no (the possessive).

However, when Chart 7-B is compared with Chart 7-C, the change becomes apparent. SAN has only one token of kare, ‘kare no (possessive)’, and there is no point in categorising it into a particle group, but its near-absence is meaningful when compared with the other two novels and high frequency of the personal name (Sanshirō) in Chart 7-B. The kare tokens of Daisuke and Kenzō account for 93% and 81% of the total kare tokens in SORE and MICH respectively. This means that the figures in Chart 7-C are largely indicative of the distribution of kare in these two novels.

These two charts illustrate a number of features:

<wa and gan/no particle groups>

- in SAN, the personal name but not kare is used for the protagonist,
- in SORE, both the personal name and kare are used, however the former is still much more frequent than the latter,
- in MICH, the frequency of the personal name halves and is overtaken by that of kare,

<Other groups>

- the frequencies of personal names marked by no, nilo and others groups are relatively unchanged; however they show small increases in nilo and others groups in MICH,
- in SORE, both the personal name and kare show an increase but the personal name is more frequent than kare, and
- in MICH, kare shows a large increase in every group.

What all these figures indicate is that 1) before kare assumed its regular use in Soseki’s novels as in SAN, personal names had been frequently used for third person reference; 2) when kare started to appear regularly as in SORE, the frequencies of both personal
names and kare increased, but the use of kare is largely limited to the topic and possessive; 3) finally in MICH, kare established itself as the main 3PP by extending its use to the object, subject and others, and surpassing the frequency of the personal name; 4) and the frequencies of the personal names decrease in the topic and subject groups but maintain their uses in other particle groups, in spite of the much larger proportions of increase of kare in these groups. In summary, the overall tendencies are that the names for third person reference with particles either decrease (eg. wa and, to a lesser degree, gaino) or remain relatively even (eg. no, nilo and others), while the 3PP, kare, with particles increases markedly in every particle group.

Against Okumura’s hypothesis that states “the kare 3PPs were introduced into Japanese not to replace something pre-existing but to fill a vacant gap”, Charts 7-B & 7-C demonstrate three main features: the pre-existing function of personal names to refer to third persons; the competition of this type and the kare type following the introduction of the latter; and the eventual decrease of the former in the main particle groups, wa and gaino. These show that the kare 3PPs did not fill a vacant gap but slowly took over the referential function of personal names in two areas (the topic and subject). However, in nilo and others groups, both personal names and kare show an increase, indicating that kare is not taking over personal names in these groups.

In terms of the growth as distinct from the frequency, the possessive function of ‘kare + no’ shows a proportionately higher growth rate. ‘Sanshirō + wa’ and ‘Daisuke + wa’ in Chart 7-B have high frequencies. Therefore the similarly high frequency of ‘kare (Kenzō)+ wa’ in Chart 7-C can be considered a simple shift of referential function from personal names in SAN and SORE to kare in MICH. Compared with these ‘Sanshirō + no’ and ‘Daisuke + no’ in Chart 7-B have relatively small frequencies but ‘kare (Kenzō) + no’ in Chart 7-C shows much higher frequency that cannot be explained as a simple transfer of an existing function. The frequency rate of ‘kare + no’ in MICH goes far beyond that of pre-existing ‘personal name + no’. It may be possible to interpret it as a new tendency for overt expressions of the possessive. In other words, the possessive
reference of *kare* is proportionately more frequently expressed than the subject/topic reference.

7.5.3 *Kare* 3PPs and variety of particles

The other significant change that is observed in Soseki’s use of the *kare* 3PPs is the change in the variety of particles that is partially seen in Table 7-10 (see the increased frequency of *kare* in the ‘others’ group). As the increased variety of referents contributed to the frequency increase of *kare* (see section 7.4), the particle variety may be related to the increased frequency of *kare*. In order to find out the relationship between the two, both type and token frequencies of particles that collocate with *kare* are closely examined in this section.

| Table 7-11 Type frequencies of particles collocating with *kare* 3PPs (raw figures) |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|                                 | neko | boku | kusa | gubi | kofu | san | sore | mon | higa | koji | koko | mich | mei | Total |
| Type                            | 9    | 2    | 5    | 4    | 4    | 5   | 11   | 13  | 27   | 30   | 15   | 19   | 37   | 60   |
| Token                           | 204  | 2    | 30   | 8    | 14   | 15  | 339  | 313 | 937  | 816  | 346  | 1,500| 2,605| 7,129|

Detailed types and tokens of particles that immediately follow the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s novels are shown in Table 7-11. Apart from the very first novel, NEKO, which has 9 types of particles, the first four novels have a limited variety: only five types, *wa*, *no* (possessive), *no* (subject), *ga* and *o*, appear with the *kare* type in these novels. In SORE, the variety increases to the double figures and it keeps increasing, except in KOKO and MICH, until the final novel (MEI), which has 37 varieties. The change in type frequency correlates remarkably with the change in token frequency captured in Chart 7-A, which shows SORE as the first novel with a dramatic increase of token frequency and which shows an almost continuous growth in frequency except for a sudden dip in KOKO. As mentioned before, KOKO is a first person narrative novel and a large part of it is written in a letter format. These may be reasons for its lower frequency among Soseki’s later novels. Apart from KOKO, Table 7-11 suggests that the increase in type frequency affects the increase in token frequency. This reflects the generalization of function – the *kare* 3PPs coming to be used in more and more contexts and eventually gaining wider distribution and meanings (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 102), as explained in section 7.2.
In summary, this section tested Okumura’s hypothesis, that “the kare 3PPs were introduced into Japanese not to replace something pre-existing but to fill a vacant gap by supplying the subject, possessive, and object, and of these three the subject filling is its main function”. My investigations of particles demonstrate: first, the pre-existing and frequent referential use of personal names in Soseki’s novels; second, the process of the takeover by the kare 3PPs in wa/ga (topic/subject) and no (possessive) areas, and later the expansion in the other areas as well; and third, the increase in the type frequency correlated with the token frequency increase. These observations indicate that the kare 3PPs were not introduced to fill a vacant gap but to share an existing function with personal names and that these slowly displaced the latter.

In terms of the kare 3PPs’ main function as subject fillers as speculated by Okumura, the frequency alone shows that the topic marker (wa) collocates most frequently with the kare 3PPs. However, the possessive case particle that did not collocate as frequently with personal names as wa/ga shows a proportionately much higher rate of appearance with the kare 3PPs than the topic particle. Therefore it is not conclusive which one of these is the main function of the kare 3PPs.

The investigation of types of particles in Soseki’s novels also revealed the close relationship between the type and token frequencies in his use of the kare 3PPs.

7.6 Conclusion

This chapter followed the changing function of the kare 3PPs and their frequency increase, starting from the specialising process of kare and are in the Edo period, and the subsequent generalization of kare in the Meiji period. The first investigation of referents of kare and are in the late Edo and Meiji periods demonstrates the specialization of kare

2 Other terms of reference such as relationship terms and common nouns that are not investigated in this study may have followed a similar pattern of change as personal name.
to human and are to non-human reference through time. The former progressed earlier than the latter and by the end (around the 1860s) of the Edo period there were very few tokens of kare referring to non-human referents, while are continued to be used for both human and non-human reference until the late (around the 1900s) Meiji period.

The second investigation of the kare 3PP referents in Soseki's novels shows the expansion of the referents from the unfamiliar/outer circle of people (e.g. strangers and generic groups) to the more familiar/inner circle of people (e.g. main characters). This indicates the generalization (expanding referent range) of the kare 3PPs, which were initially used for more limited and specific reference.

The third investigation revealed another process of generalisation, this time in particle range. This followed the way the kare 3PPs took over the function of personal names in the area of third person reference. Contrary to Okumura's view that the kare type was brought into Japanese novels for their new function that did not exist previously in Japanese, my investigation has revealed the competition between the pre-existing proper nouns and the new 3PPs, and the expansion of the latter and decline of the third person reference of the former. This process is identical to the typical function of grammaticalized items described by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 126) as competitors rather than gap fillers.
Chapter 8

Kanojo

Change must always be seen in terms of variation, and formula for change should therefore be A > A/B > B. Even so, it still needs to be stated that it is by no means inevitable that A will disappear. A and B may instead each go their own ways and continue to coexist as divergent reflexes of a historically single form over many centuries, even millennia. (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 122)

8.1 Introduction

In the Edo period (1603-1868), the 3PP, kare, had a broad function and meaning, covering the equivalent territories of, he, she, they and it combined. In the following Meiji period (1868-1912), the separation of male, female, singular, plural, human and non-human occurred. This chapter will focus, out of all these sub-categories, on the female 3PP (kanojo) and investigate its formation, using a number of novels written in the Meiji to Taishō (1912-1926) periods.

This chapter consists of two main parts: a historical investigation of kanojo (she) before Soseki and an investigation of kanojo in Soseki’s novels. The first part investigates kanojo as it appeared in novels between the late Edo and mid Meiji periods (Section 8.2). And the second part deals with a corpus analysis of kanojo in Soseki’s 11 novels – frequencies and types (Section 8.3) – and a qualitative analysis of kanojo in selected novels focusing on the varieties of forms, referents and specialized uses (Sections 8.4 and 8.5).

My investigations reveal:

- the formative process of kanojo is demonstrated by the co-existence of various forms and annotations in the works of early Meiji writers,
- the broadening referent range of kanojo from the main heroine only to any female character in Soseki’s novels,
the process of consolidation of various female 3PPs to one form, 彼女(kanojo), and specialized uses of kano onna and ano onna in Soseki’s later works.

8.2 History of kanojo

8.2.1 彼女 in Dutch studies in the Edo period

The first written appearance of 彼女 (kare + onna [woman]) had long been thought to be in a Dutch-Japanese dictionary, Doeff haruma (1815), edited by Henderic Doeff, Yoshio Eiho and other translators (Hida 2002, Sogó 1988, Hirota 1969). However, Morioka (1999: 49) recently pointed out a number of entries of 彼女 in a less known Dutch grammar book, Orandago hōge (1812), written by Fujibayashi Fuzan three years earlier than Doeff haruma. Neither of these books has an annotation for 彼女, so how these two characters were pronounced together is not known. The examples of 彼女 in these two books are shown below. Example (1) is an entry in Orandago hōge and Example (2) in Doeff haruma (stress added).

(1) Zij is zeer schoon. 彼女は甚美なり [彼女 wa hanahada bi nari.] (She is very beautiful.)
    (Orandago hōge, Fujibayashi Fuzan. 1812. in Morioka 1999: 49)

(2) Zij is zeer schoon. 彼女は甚美シサ [彼女 wa hanahada utsukushii] (She is very beautiful.)
    (Doeff haruma, Henderic Doeff, Yoshio Eiho et al. 1815. in Hida 2002: 82)

The above examples are almost identical, except the slight variation in sentence ending: Example (2) is more colloquial than Example (1). The question is how they pronounced 彼女. There are some clues for this. Orandago hōge also has entries of 彼男 (kare + otoko [man]) as shown in Example (3).

(3) Hij is vertrokken. 彼男は発足セリ [彼男 wa hossoku seri] (He is gone.)

In modern Japanese, 彼男 is normally pronounced kano otoko, therefore, 彼女 could be read as kano onna to correspond to kano otoko (Sugimoto 1990, Yanabu 1996). However, in another Dutch grammar book, Bangosen quoted in Sogó (1988: 27), Katsuragawa Hosai (1798) wrote that “彼 男ニ云、彼 女ニ云 “ [Kare otoko ni iu, kare onna ni iu] (Kare refers to a man. Kare refers to a woman). And Fujibayashi’s explanation of the 3PP follows:
Daisanjin towa kare o iunari. Kare wa ware nanji no hoka o shōkosuru gen naru o motte (…) naduketaru nari. (…) ware nanji wa nannyaochū aittijite onaji keredomo. Kore nomi onoono sono gen ini su.

(The third person pronoun is called kare. Kare refers to someone other than I and you. (...) Although, I and you do not differentiate male and female, this [3PP] alone has a different form for each [for male and female in Dutch])

(Orandago höge 1812 Orandago hooge quoted in Morioka 1999: 49, stress added.)

Fujibayashi is saying that kare is used for the translation of the 3PP from Dutch to Japanese and is used for both genders in Japanese, although Dutch has different forms for male and female. The above comments by Katsuragawa and Fujibayashi suggest that the same 3PP (at least in sound), kare, was used for male and female alike. From this evidence, the possibility of both 彼男 and 彼女 pronounced kare is equally high as them being pronounced kano otoko and kano onna. In the former case, 男 (man) and 女 (woman) that follow 彼 (kare) could be considered as gender markers added to clarify the referent in writing (Morioka 1999: 160), since they do not add any sound to the compound words. However, Chapter 6 (especially, 6.3) showed that kare predominantly appears in formal Edo yomihon (text-based formal novels) and in Meiji novels written in a formal Japanese such as Mori Ogai’s German trilogy, while kano onna and ano onna in Edo colloquial fiction. Therefore, it is more likely that 彼女 in Example (1) and 彼男 in Example (3) were pronounced kare and 彼女 in Example (2) kano onna or ano onna, since the former are written in a formal and the latter in a more colloquial writing style.

Further, examples of 彼, 彼男 and 彼女 annotated as kare are found in Meiji literature. Shimei annotates 彼男 as kare in Meguriai (The Encounter, 1986) as shown in Example (5).

(5) 「貴君は彼男（かれ）を御存知でしたか？」
Anata wa kare o gozonji deshitaka. (Do you know him?) Futabatei Shimei, 1886: 391.

Higuchi Ichiyō, on the other hand, annotates both 彼男 and 彼女 as are in Takekurabe (1895). These examples show that the gender is only distinguished orthographically but not orally in the early to mid Meiji period. An example of 彼女 annotated as
kanojo in modern novels is not found until 1887 in Tsubouchi Shōyō’s Tōsei shosei katagi¹.

In short, although the first attested appearance of the character compound 彼女 in Dutch studies was in 1812, its pronunciation is uncertain because of the absence of annotation. However, it is most likely to have been ‘kare’ or ‘kano onna’ rather than ‘kanojo’. In early Meiji literature, there is no evidence of 彼女 annotated as ‘kanojo’ until 1887, instead; kare or are was used for both male and female reference.

8.2.2 Referents of kare in Edo novels

If kare was used for both male and female, what was the proportion of each and also those of plural and non-human reference? This section sets out to investigate tokens of kare in Edo fiction to find out a distribution pattern of each referent category (male/female, singular/plural and human/non-human) to find out how 彼女 came into existence. The detailed distribution of kare is investigated using the yomihon genre as source texts. This is because yomihon has the highest frequency of kare among various genres of Edo fiction, as demonstrated in Chapter 7. In yomihon, there are more male than female characters: average ratio of male to female is 5 to 2. The ratio is fairly consistent across the novels surveyed here.

Table 8-1 Referents of kare and tokens of kano onna in yomihon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>text</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>F%</th>
<th>kare (singular)</th>
<th>kare plural</th>
<th>彼女</th>
<th>彼／彼等</th>
<th>彼女 onna</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ugetsu monogatari</td>
<td>1776</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chūhongata yomihon</td>
<td>1799-1810</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saibara kidan</td>
<td>1811</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toribeyama²</td>
<td>1825</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishōnenroku³</td>
<td>1842-8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M: male, F: female.  
* kano onnadomo (plural)

Table 8-1 shows the tokens of kare in various yomihon novels are counted electronically, and arranged and grouped manually according to referent types: singular male, singular female, non-human and plural referents. It also shows a small number of tokens of 彼女 annotated as kano onna in yomihon. The figure shows that

¹ However, the single entry of 彼女 (kanojo) in Shosei has to be approached with caution, because the same two-character word is annotated as kano onna in the second edition (1887)(see 8.3.2).

² The full title: Toribeyama shirabe no tateito.

³ The full title: Kinseisetsu bishōnenroku
in the late 18th to early 19th century, *kare* had four referent groups: singular human male, singular human female, plural human, and non-human (singular and plural). However, the proportion of each group demonstrates a gradual change over time. The following changes can be observed in Table 8-1.

- In the category of singular human reference, the proportion of female increases over time from 10% in 1776 to close to 45% in 1848.
- In plural reference, two forms — *kare* and *karera* — co-exist for a while, but in the mid 19th century, *kare* seems to have retreated from plural reference to singular reference.
- A smaller number of tokens of non-human reference of *kare* exist until the end of the Edo period. However, the *Bishōnenroku* (1842-8) have no token of non-human *kare* in spite of its large volume. This indicates that *kare* was rarely used for non-human reference by the end of the Edo period in *yomihon*.

In summary, although various types of *kare* referents co-existed in the middle part of the Edo period, the plural and non-human were decreasing in number and rare in the late Edo period. This means that by the end of the Edo period, *kare* was almost exclusively used for singular human reference and the proportions of male and female were almost even in spite of the higher ratio of male characters in each novel. While *karera* was established as the plural form, the female third person singular form, *kanojo*, is not found in Edo fiction investigated here. However, a small number of 彼女 annotated as *kano onna* are found in the late Edo period.

### 8.3 Change in 3PP use in the Meiji period

This section will attempt to find the reasons behind the increased use of *kanojo* and *kare* in Soseki's novels by comparing the detailed use of these terms with that of other writers and other types of writing.

---

4 *Edogo daijiten* (*The Big Edo Dictionary*, 1974) lists an example of *kanojo* in *Tenpō gannen nezame no kurigoto* (1830) written by Tamenaga Shunsui.
8.3.1 Kano

*Kano* was the only term that regularly appeared in both formal and colloquial novels in the Edo and early Meiji periods. But it almost disappeared in Soseki’s novels except in the form of *kanojo*. This section will examine tokens of *kano* in three writers’ novels – Shōyō's *Shosei* (1885), Ogai’s German trilogy (1890-1) and Soseki’s 13 novels (1905-1916) – to identify the process of the change of this term during the Meiji period. Futabatei’s *Ukigumo* is excluded from the investigation, since it contains only two tokens of *kano*.

Table 8-2 shows the tokens of *kano* and terms that directly follow them. In Shōyō’s novel *kano* has a diverse range of nouns following it: 40 tokens of *kano* with 33 varieties of nouns to follow (two nouns appear three times each and three nouns twice each after *kano*). Four out of 13 instances of *kano* in Ogai’s novels are followed by *hitobito* (people) and each of the rest by a different noun (none of which are *onna*). Compared to these, out of 19 tokens of *kano* (excluding *kanojo*) in Soseki’s 13 novels, 13 are followed by *onna* (woman) and a different noun follows each of the remaining six, showing a tendency to collocate with one particular term and a decrease in variety.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms that follow kano</th>
<th>Shōyō</th>
<th>Ogai</th>
<th>Soseki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>type</td>
<td>type</td>
<td>type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kano-nanigashi</em> 3</td>
<td>(someone)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kano-kakoiomo</em> 2</td>
<td>(concubine)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kano-Tomoyoshi</em> 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x18 terms</td>
<td>personal names 9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kano-tokei</em> (watch) 3</td>
<td>(philosopher)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kano-torikemono</em> 2</td>
<td>(animals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1x10 other terms</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shōyō’s use demonstrates that *kano* was used as a demonstrative that could precede any noun, especially proper nouns, without a strong collocation with a particular noun. And in nine cases, *kano* is used in binary opposition to *kono* (*this –*
demonstrative adjective) or kore (this – demonstrative pronoun). In Ogai’s and
Soseki’s novels, kano seems to be narrowing its range of collocation, the same nouns
(hitobito and onna respectively) appearing repeatedly after it, thus losing the function
of a demonstrative and becoming, in combination with the following noun, more like
a regular personal pronoun. Also, 12 tokens of non-human reference in Shōyō’s
novel and three in Ogai’s are found but none in Soseki’s. This shows the
consolidation of kano to human reference.

The three features found in Table 8-2 – a decreased variety of terms that follow kano,
a strong tendency to collocate with a particular term, onna (woman), and
consolidation to human reference, demonstrate the process of specialization of kano.
It is possible to see specialization as an elimination process is working here, as
certain collocations occur frequently, other combinations of terms in the same
category become disused and disappear from use. Thus the cline of kano reference
can be shown as below:

someone/something > someone > woman

Although it is not shown in Table 8-2, in Soseki’s novels the shift goes further and
kano onna becomes kanojo and the frequency increases dramatically. Table 8-3
shows the tokens of ‘kano + noun’ and kanojo in Soseki’s 13 novels. Neither form is
used frequently in the first half of his body of work. Three out of four tokens of kano
in SAN, seven out of nine in HIGA and one in KOJI are kano onna written as 彼女,
which shows that the collocation of kano and onna is strong and habitual by then.

| Table 8-3 Tokens of ‘kano + noun’ and ‘kanojo’ in Soseki’s novels (raw figures) |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| D: dialogue. N: narrative.      | neko   | botc   | kusa   | gubi   | kofu   | san    | sore   | mon    | higa   | koji   | koko   | mich   | mei    |
| kano+ noun                      | 2      | 3      | 1      | 1      | 8      | 15     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        | Total  |
| N                               | 1      | 1      | 1      | 2      | 7/2    | 1      |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
| kanojo                          | 1*     |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |

*non-human reference. Figures in red are kano onna written as 彼女

However, kano onna and other ‘kano + noun’ forms disappear from Soseki’s novels
after KOJI; instead a shorter form, kanojo written as 彼女, takes over the position of
the 3PP with an increased frequency. This suggests the reduction effect in which the
"contracted forms have a higher frequency than the full forms" (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 128) and further stage of grammaticalization called divergence or split (Heine and Reh 1984: 57-9) in which a contracted form takes on a new meaning and function and increases its frequency, while the original form remains as an autonomous element and retains its lexical elements and becomes less used, and in some cases disappears completely (Hopper 1991: 22). This process will be more closely examined in Chapter 9.

*Kano*, which regularly appeared both in formal and colloquial Edo novels, disappears from Soseki’s later novels except in the form of *kanojo*. The investigation of each token of *kano* in *Shōyō*, Ogai and Soseki’s novels demonstrates the clines of *kano* to collocate with first both human and non-human terms, then predominantly human, and finally ‘woman’ in the form of *kano onna*. This form was further grammaticalized to *kanojo*, which became the main female 3PP and increased its frequency in Soseki’s later novels.

### 8.3.2 Referents of *kare* and *kanojo* in Meiji novels

This section will continue to look at the change in the referents of *kare* and other emerging forms – especially the female singular, *kanojo* – in Meiji novels. Table 8-4 shows the tokens of male and female referents of *kare, kanojo* in a selected number of novels that were written between 1887 and 1908.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>男 <em>kare</em></th>
<th>女 <em>kanojo</em></th>
<th>其他注釋</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tōsei shosei katagi</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ajikenashi</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai trilogy</td>
<td>1890-1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ichiyō short stories</td>
<td>1895-6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>are 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajōtakon</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hakai</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>5+(are 3)</td>
<td>(are 2)</td>
<td>aitsu 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futon</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanshirō</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>kano onna 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amerika monogatari</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In *yomihon* the percentage of female reference of *kare* was increasing towards the end of the Edo period (see Chapter 7). This trend seems to continue into the Meiji...
period until the 1890s, when it starts to decrease rapidly and kare is almost displaced by a new female form, kanojo by 1908. However the change was not straightforward. Before kanojo established itself as the singular female 3PP, 彼女 annotated as kano onna – kano (that) + onna (woman) – was more commonly used for a while.

As a written word, 彼女 appears in Meiji fiction as early as in the late 1880s but the pronunciation varies. For example, in Futabatei’s Ukigumo (1887), there is no token of kanojo but the kanji word 彼女 appears once annotated as are. The same annotation is used for other kanji combinations such as 彼 and 彼娘 in the same novel. Following the Edo colloquial tradition, Ukigumo exclusively uses are and ano for third person reference and the characters like 女 and 娘 that follow 彼 could be seen as gender markers without sound. To Futabatei who tried to write in a Tokyo dialect, kanojo was not acceptable as a colloquial Tokyo term. Similarly, Higuchi Ichiyō uses 彼女 annotated as are and in Tōson’s Hakai (1906), there are five tokens of 彼 annotated as are and these are used for both male and female.

Tsubouchi Shōyō, on the other hand, uses kanojo once in his Shosei (1885).

(6) 此小娘は年の比。まだ漸々十四五と見ゆれど。頼るコミッシャクレタ質にて。容色も人年の 多い方なり。侖にいふお転婆のれども。彼女ハ活発だ。などといって、書生運によらはる る小娘なり。その名をお豊といふ。（p. 53）
(Kono komusume wa toshi no koro, mada yoyō jūshigō to miyuredo. Sukoburu komasshakureta tachi nite, kaodachi mo ninso no o hōnari. Zoku ni ju otenbanare domo. kanojo wa kappatsuda nado to itte, shoseiren ni yorokobaruru komusumenari. Sono na o Otoyo to ju.)
Though this girl looks only 14 or 15, [she] talks older and isn’t bad looking. A tomboy, so to speak. Students would say that she is lively and enjoy her company. Her name is Toyo.

In Example (6), the narrator describes a geisha called Toyo quoting a student’s remark, “Kanojo wa kappatsu da” (She is lively). Because of the nature of Japanese as well as the varied use of punctionations at the time, it is hard to determine if this remark is a direct or indirect quotation. Later in the same novel, two more passages similar to Example (6) appear.

(7) そもそも芸妓弁吉と聞こえたらへ。こいつ頗るのお転婆キャットで。随分もてあっての 秋 大姐さ。（P.161）
“Somosomo geigi benkichi to kikoetaru wa, koitsu sukoburu no otenba kyatto de, zuibun motemashi no furuance sa.”
[The geisha called Benkichi, this girl is quite a tomboy cat and an embarrassing old fox.]
Koitsu (she) in Example (7) is an older geisha called Benkichi and aitsu (he) in Example (8) refers to a student called Miyaga. Both tokens appear in a dialogue between male students.

In Shosei, Shōyō sometimes uses English personal pronouns directly in the main text and adds Japanese annotations as shown below.

(9) She (シイ/あれ) に多少迷惑をかけたし。
She (shiisare) ni meiwaku o kaketa si. [Since I got her into trouble]

In the original text printed vertically, ‘シイ’ is written on the right hand side of ‘She’ and ‘あれ’ on the left hand side in a smaller print to indicate that ‘She’ is read as ‘シイ/shii/’ and its corresponding Japanese is ‘あれ(are)’. There are three more examples of this kind in Shosei. The characters in brackets are annotations written on the right hand side of the words.

(10)あれ(シイ) [are (shii)]
(11)シイ(彼女) [shii (aitsu)]
(12)シイ(あの女) [shii (ano onna)]

Example (10) is a case of ‘あれ’ annotated as ‘シイ’. Examples (11) and (12) are the cases of ‘シイ’ annotated as ‘彼女’ and ‘あの女’ in that order. Compared to Futabatei’s Ukigumo that tried to be true to the colloquial Tokyo language, Shoyo’s Shosei captures a peculiar students’ language that was in fashion among high school and university students in the Meiji period. In doing so, Shōyō incorporates many foreign terms in his Japanese text. The ‘shii’ in Examples (10) – (12) is a transliteration of ‘she’. These examples show that, apart from the one appearance of kanojo in Example (6), ‘she’ is usually paired with the a-pronoun such as are, aitsu and ano onna. This indicates that the word kanojo was not widely used in speech even among the liberal students when Shosei was written and this could be the reason for the changed annotation (from kanojo to kano onna) in the second edition.
8.3.3 Specialization of *kare* and emergence of *kanojo*

In the Meiji period, up to the 1890s tokens of *kare* referring to a female person are higher in number than those referring to a male person as shown in Table 8-4. Then, the female reference decreases and is hardly seen in the 1900s, while male reference increases in number. At the same time, another female 3PP, *kanojo*, is appearing more frequently. The 11 tokens of *kanojo* in Tayama Katai’s *Futon* (1907) all refer to the heroine, Yoshiko, five of them appearing in the first two pages in a monologue of the main protagonist, Tokio. In fact, Katai’s use of *kare* and *kanojo* tends to be limited to particular persons in his novels. For instance, *kare* in *Futon* refers to Tokio only and in *Ippeisotsu* (1917), *kare* is synonymous with the nameless soldier who dies in the end. In a sense, Katai uses *kare* and *kanojo* like personal names rather than pronouns that can be used for anyone in the story.

By comparison, *kanojo* in Nagai Kafū’s *Amerika monogatari* (American Stories, *Amerika* hereafter, 1908), a collection of short stories he wrote in America, has a slightly broader range of referents. For example, in one of the stories – *Shikago no futsuka* (*Two Days in Chicago*), *kanojo* refers to both the heroine (Stella) and a woman at a guesthouse who only plays a minor role. In *Amerika*, both *kare* and *kanojo* have higher frequencies than in *Futon* and the specialization of *kare* as the male 3PP and *kanojo* as the female 3PP appears to be well established.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PP</strong></td>
<td><strong>annotation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼</td>
<td><em>kare</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼の男</td>
<td><em>kano otoko</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼の男</td>
<td><em>kano otoko</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼の人</td>
<td><em>ano hito</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼人</td>
<td><em>ano hito</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼女</td>
<td><em>aitsu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼の男</td>
<td><em>ano otoko</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>彼の女</td>
<td><em>ano onna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, Kafū uses various annotations for the kanji 彼 such as 彼男 (*ano otoko*), 彼の男 (*kano otoko*), 彼人 (*ano hito*), and 彼女 (*aitsu*) as shown in Table 8-5. Similarly for 彼女, a variety of annotations are used: *kanojo*, *kano onna*, *ano onna*, and *are*. These indicate that although *kare* and *kanojo* were establishing themselves
as the major 3PPs for each gender, a variety of forms and pronunciations co-existed around the 1900s. Interestingly, Kafū’s next book, Furansu monogatari (French Stories), a collection of short stories based on his stay in France, which he wrote after his return to Japan, contains fewer tokens of kare and kanojo. This suggests some kind of foreign influence on his writing in Amerika.

Soseki’s SAN (1908), which was published in the same year as Amerika, shows the clear specialization of kare to a male singular third person reference, albeit at a low frequency. However, it has no token of kanojo, but three tokens of kano onna written as 彼女. These three tokens of kano onna refer to the same woman, Mineko. In this sense, at this stage, Soseki’s use of kano onna is similar to that of Katai’s: kano onna is used more like a personal name.

In summary, following the Edo tradition, kare continued to be used for both male and female reference until the late 19th century. Around that time, 彼女 (kanojo) began to be used regularly as a female 3PP. Although, 彼女 (kanojo) was the preferred form and annotation, various annotations of 彼女 (kano onna, ano onna, are, kare, aitsu, etc.) as well as various forms of kanojo (彼女, 彼の女, かの女, etc.) co-existed at that time, indicating a transitional process.

8.4 Kanojo in Soseki’s novels
8.4.1 Changing use of female 3PPs in Soseki’s novels
The previous section showed that Soseki’s novel SAN had a typical use of 3PPs similar to that in Katai’s Futon. That is, the specialized use of kare for male singular, emerging but limited use of 彼女 (kanojo or kano onna). This section will focus on Soseki’s writing and closely examine the change in the use of kanojo. First, the frequencies of kare and kanojo in Soseki’s 13 novels are counted electronically using the CD-ROM version of his works contained in Shincho bunko Meiji no bungo (1997). Then a number of novels that show some significant patterns are investigated in detail.

Table 8-6 shows the tokens of onna, ano onna, kano onna and kanojo as 3PPs in
Soseki’s novels. There is no token of those in BOTC (1906), and therefore it is not included in the table. Several interesting features can be found in Table 8-6. These are:

- *onna and *kanojo appear only in narrative, while *ano onna and *kano onna appear in both dialogue and narrative.
- KOJI has an unusually high number of tokens of *ano onna in narrative.
- Tokens of *kanojo increase dramatically between MON (1910) and HIGA (1911), from 8 to 180 (from 6 to 93 per 100,000 characters).
- *kano onna disappears after KOJI (1913).
- pronominal use of *onna and *kano onna disappear after KOJI.
- After KOJI, *kanojo seems to have established itself as the female 3PP in narrative, and *ano onna is restricted to dialogue and monologue.

Table 8-6 Tokens of *onna, *ano onna, *kano onna and *kanojo in Soseki’s novels
(raw figures)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NEKO 1905</th>
<th>KUSA 1906</th>
<th>GUB 1907</th>
<th>SAN 1909</th>
<th>SORE 1909</th>
<th>MON 1910</th>
<th>HIGA 1911</th>
<th>KOJI 1913</th>
<th>KOKO 1914</th>
<th>MICHI 1915</th>
<th>MEI 1916</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>onna</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ano onna</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onna</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>8*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kano onna</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1674</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


From these features it is possible to observe the process of pronoun change in Soseki’s writing and KOJI seems to be the key novel written in the middle of the transition. Until KOJI, the four different forms of female 3PPs co-existed in his writing, each at a varying degree of frequency. *Onna in narrative, and *ano onna in dialogue and monologue seem to be the preferred choice in the first half of his career. However, after KOJI only two forms, *ano onna and *kanojo survived, the former in dialogue and monologue and the latter in narrative. However, the change was not sudden. The overlapping period of the four forms is observed in Table 8-6. *Kanojo appears in small numbers in Soseki’s early novels, gradually increases in frequency, then finally becomes the dominant form.
The increase in the use of kanojo is accompanied by a functional change, too. The two single incidences of kanojo in Soseki’s first two novels, NEKO and KUSA, in Table 8-6, are not used as female singular 3PPs in a strict sense. These are shown below.

(13) とにかく人間は愚かなものであるから猫でられ声で膝の傍へ寄って行くと、大抵の場合において彼もしくは彼女を愛するものと誤解して、わが為すままに任せるのみか...
Tonikaku ningen wa orokana mono dearu kara naderaregoe de hiza no katawara e yotte iku to, taitei no bai ni oite kare moshikiwa kanojo o aisuru mono to gokaishite, waga nasu omama ni makaseru nomi ka...
(Anyone, human beings are easy to fool. When I approach [a human being] with a purr, almost always [he or she] would think that I like him or her and let me do whatever I want.)
(Wagahai wa neko dearu. Shinchō bunko publication, 1905: 235.)

(14) 幾百年の星雲を、人目にふるわぬ山陰に落ち付き払って暮らしている。只一眼見ただけ
最後！見た人彼女の魅力から金輪際、免れる事は出来ない。
Ikuhyakunen no seiso o, hitome ni kakaranu yamakage ni ochitsuki haratte kurashite iru.
Tada hitome mita ga saigo! Mita hito wa kanojo no maryoku kara konrinzai, manukaruru koto wa dekina.
([She] calmly dwells in a remote place in the shadow of mountains for many hundreds of years. One single look [at her]! No one ever could escape from her magical power.)
(Kusamakura, Shinchō bunko publication, 1906: 121.)

Example (13) is a remark made by the narrator (a cat) on human nature. The cat talks about how easily humans can be manipulated. The kanojo here is used as a pair with kare to refer to an indefinite, non-specific person and a reflexive, jibun, is normally used in such a situation. This has a flavour of translation. Example (14) is an example of personification. Kanojo refers to camellias. This kind of rhetoric (personification) did not exist in Edo fiction and first appeared in Doeff haruma – a 1833 Dutch-Japanese dictionary (Sugimoto 1990). Therefore, these two entries of kanojo are rather exceptional in Japanese writing.

彼女 (kano onna) in SAN and SORE and 彼女 (kanojo) in MON each refer to a particular person, Mineko, Michiyo and Oyone, respectively. HIGA (1911) is the first novel in which kanojo refers to more than one female character in the story. In fact, eight female characters are referred to as kanojo in HIGA from the main heroine to a peripheral servant and from a toddler to a middle-aged widow. In this sense, it could be said that kanojo acquired a Western style third person pronominal function – a neutral representative of a third person – in HIGA. However, in KOKO (1914), kanojo is only used three times and all of them refer to the same person; otherwise, relational names such as okusan (Mrs.), ojōsan (Miss), sai (wife) and oba (aunt) are
frequently used. This could be because a large part of KOKO is written as a letter. Only the last two novels have an indiscriminate use of kanojo and the frequencies are also quite high. In other words, Soseki’s novels tell a chronicle of kanojo from infancy to fully-grown in modern colloquial writing.

8.4.2 Referents of 彼女 (kanojo/kano onna)

The previous section demonstrated the frequency change in different forms of female 3PPs in Soseki’s novels and the gradual shift from one form to another. However, in order to find out the details of referents and contexts, a qualitative method has to be employed. This section will investigate the following features, which were not examined through quantitative analysis:

- Referents of 彼女 (kanojo/kano onna)
- Different uses of ano onna and kanojo
- The shift from kano onna to kanojo

**Table 8-7 Referents of 彼女 (kanojo/kano onna) in Soseki’s earlier novels (raw figures)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>novel</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>annotation</th>
<th>referent</th>
<th>token</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEKO</td>
<td>1905</td>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td>human being</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KUSA</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td>camelia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>kano onna</td>
<td>Mineko</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td>kano onna</td>
<td>Michiko</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td>Oyone</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>kano onna</td>
<td>Chiyoko</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanojo</td>
<td>Sunaga’s mother</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chiyoko</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sunaga’s mother</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Saku (a maid)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yoiko (Chiyoko’s niece)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yumi (a maid)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a hair dresser</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a woman on the train</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a young woman</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-7 shows the referents of 彼女 annotated as kano onna or kanojo in Soseki’s novels written between 1905 and 1911. These tokens are sorted manually according to the referents. There is no token of 彼女 in two novels, BOTC (1906) and KOFU (1908); therefore, these are not included in the table. In the first five novels in Table 8-7, 彼女 does not appear very frequently, but when it does appear, it always refers to a particular person/thing in the novel and no one else. The first two cases of kanojo,
one in NEKO and KUSA each, are used for non-specific and generic reference respectively, neither referring to a specific singular object. In SAN (1908) and SORE (1910), 彼女 refers to a particular individual but these tokens are annotated as kano onna. Therefore, among Soseki’s novels, the first appearance of 彼女 that refers to a specific person and annotated as kanojo is, in fact, in MON (1910).

There are similarities in the use of 彼女 in these three novels (SAN, SORE and MON). First, in all three novels, 彼女 refers to the main heroines, Mineko in SAN, Michiyo in SORE and Oyone in MON, in spite of the existence of other female characters. Second, 彼女 are used in a very specific situation. In SAN, all three tokens of 彼女 (kano onna) occur in the conversation between Sanshirō and Yojirō (Shanshiro’s friend), where Yojirō questions Sanshiro about his feelings for Mineko (pp. 195 & 251)⁵. In SORE, 彼女 (kano onna) appears when Daisuke (the main protagonist) confesses his feelings for Michiyo and realizes the gravity of the situation that he has created for her (pp. 248-9). In MON, six out of the eight tokens of 彼女 (kanojo) appear in one scene (pp. 134-6). In this scene, the tragic stillbirth of Oyone’s baby is told in retrospect. In a sense, kanojo appears to be used in this particular scene to signify the temporal gap between the past and present and the impact of the tragic event. All these examples indicate that 彼女 had a very limited function and use – reference to the main heroine in an emotionally charged situation – in Soseki’s earlier novels.

By comparison, in HIGA (1911), kanojo is used more extensively, referring to a variety of women in the novel. Although, the heroine, Chiyoko, scores the majority of the tokens, other female characters including some peripheral ones such as servants and an stranger on the train are also referred to as kanojo. In terms of age, the range of referents is quite wide, stretching from an infant (Yoiko) to an elderly woman (Sunaga’s mother). Also new are the cases of a son referring to his mother as kanojo (Sunaga → mother). This is clearly a turning point in Soseki’s use of kanojo.

Throughout Soseki’s novels, 彼女 progressed: from the 3PP use for non-specific referents (human& plant) to exclusive reference to heroines, and then, finally, to be

---

⁵ Page numbers are based on the Shinchō bunko series. See references.
used for any woman in the novel including one’s own mother. Thus, the final stage of assimilation of kanojo into Soseki’s writing as a female 3PP was achieved in HIGA. However, in HIGA, seven tokens of 彼女 (kano onna) co-exist with 彼女 (kanojo). The complete shift to kanojo occurred a few years later in Soseki’s last three novels (see section 8.6).

8.5 Female 3PPs in Sanshiro, Sorekara, Mon and Higansugimade

This section will look at a variety of female 3PPs in Soseki’s selected novels in order to identify the development of kanojo and the decline of other female 3PPs that happened during his writing career.

8.5.1 From Sanshirō to Higansugimade

Among Soseki’s novels, the first novel in which kanojo regularly appears is HIGA (1911). In the other novels before this, kanojo was either rare or totally absent. The increased frequency of kanojo between MON (which was written a year before HIGA) and HIGA is more than ten fold – from 8 to 180 tokens (6 to 91 per 100,000 characters) (see Table 8-6 in section 8.4.1). This seems to be a sudden increase and there is no indication of why and how it happened. This section attempts to give some explanations for this change by examining the four novels; HIGA and the three novels, SAN, SORE and MON that precede it.

| Table 8-8 Variations of female 3PPs in SAN, SORE, MON and HIGA (raw figures) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| novel           | character       | 彼女 kanojo 3    | 彼女 kano onna 26| 彼女 ato onna 33| 彼女 an onna 96* 2 |
|                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 15* 5            |
|                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 47               |
|                 |                 |                 |                 |                 | 1                |
| SAN (1908)      | Mineko          |                 |                 |                 |                  |
|                 | Yoshiko         |                 |                 |                 |                  |
|                 | a woman on the train |        |                 |                 |                  |
|                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                  |
| SORE (1909)     | Michiyo         | 2               | 1               | 1               | 1*               |
| MON (1910)      | Oyone           | 8               |                 |                 | 2*               |
| HIGA (1911)     | Chiyoko         | 127             | 6               | 3               | 107              |
|                 | Mrs. Sunaga     | 25              | 1               |                 |                  |
|                 | Saku (a maid)   | 15              |                 |                 |                  |
|                 | a stranger      | 1               |                 |                 |                  |
|                 | others          | 12              |                 |                 |                  |

*Tokens of onna used even after personal names are revealed.

Table 8-8 shows a selected variety of female 3PPs, 彼女 (kanojo), 彼女 (kano onna),
onna and are, and their referents in the above novels. In Table 8-8 the following features can be observed:

- Declining uses of onna* (used after personal names are revealed) and are
- Infrequent use of female 3PPs in SORE and MON
- A sudden increase of kanojo in HIGA

Each of these will be closely examined in the following sections.

8.5.2 Declining uses of onna* and are

Chapter 7 demonstrated the shift of are from human reference to non-human reference in the early Meiji period. Although Soseki still uses are occasionally for human reference, the number of token is very small. The pronominal use of the common noun, onna (woman), is most pronounced in SAN with nearly 200 tokens. The use of onna is separated into two categories: pre-identity-revelation and post-identity-revelation (for details, see Chapter 5). The continued use of onna after the person’s name is revealed is a notable feature in Soseki’s novels written between 1906 and 1909. It disappears in HIGA and in his later novels. For instance, 111 out of 191 tokens of onna in SAN in Table 8-6 appear after the identities of the women are revealed to the reader. By comparison, all 114 tokens of onna in HIGA are used before the identity is disclosed. While the other pronominal use of onna that appears before the identity of the referent is disclosed survives until KOJI (1913), it, too, ceases to be used as a personal pronoun in Soseki’s later novels.

8.5.3 Sudden increase of kanojo in HIGA

Compared with the two novels that come before and after them, SORE and MON have very few tokens of female 3PPs. The tokens in Table 8-6 alone give an impression that these novels are written without many female 3PPs and that the increase of kanojo between MON and HIGA is dramatic. However, linguistic changes usually happen slowly and there seems to be a hidden element behind this apparently sudden shift.

Chapter 5 discussed the pronominal use of personal names. In reading SORE, one intuitively notices the frequent appearances of the heroine’s name. For example, on
page 192 (Shincho bunko version) alone the name, *Michiyo*, appears 17 times in narrative, almost one per line. Since there is no other woman mentioned on that page, it is apparent whom the narrator is talking about and there is no need to repeat the name so many times. On the other hand this is also a page on which the male 3PP, *kare*, appears frequently (eight times). This suggests that at least some of the 17 appearances of *Michiyo* on page 192 are used in a similar way to a female 3PP corresponding to *kare* and could hold the key to understanding the sudden increase of *kanojo* in HIGA. For this purpose, the tokens of the heroine’s names of the four novels are counted using the CD-ROM version (names used as terms of address are excluded). Then the figures are compared with the tokens of other female 3PPs listed in Table 8-8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>novel</th>
<th>name</th>
<th>Tokens of names</th>
<th>per 100k characters</th>
<th>3PPs in Table 6</th>
<th>Name + 3PPs in Table 6</th>
<th>per 100k characters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SAN</td>
<td>Mineko</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORE</td>
<td>Michiyo</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MON</td>
<td>Oyone</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGA</td>
<td>Chiyoko</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-9 shows the names of the main heroines in the four novels and their tokens as well as the normalised frequencies of those per 100,000 characters, in comparison to the figures listed in Table 8-8. The frequencies of personal names are much higher in SORE and MON at 255 and 328 (per 100,000 characters) respectively than in SAN at 160 and HIGA at 136. However, when added to the figures of various forms of third person reference in Table 8-8, the total frequencies of third person reference in each novel are much closer to one another: SAN, SORE and HIGA at around 250, and MON at 335. In Table 8-8, SORE and MON appeared to have very few tokens of female 3PPs. In fact, these two novels have higher tokens of personal names than other novels and it seems that personal names are used in the place of personal pronouns. In this sense the seemingly sudden change in Table 8-8 was hiding the higher frequencies of personal names and if a proportion of these are used in a role similar to 3PPs the change is not sudden at all.

All these seem to indicate a pattern of change in the frequency of female third person reference is a combination of multiple ongoing changes involving generalisation of a
particular form (*kanojo*) and specialisation of others (*kano onna, onna, ano onna*, etc.) as shown in Figure 8-1 below.

Figure 8-1 Pattern of change in the frequency of female third person reference

![Diagram showing the pattern of change in the frequency of female third person reference](image)

In Soseki’s early novels, four forms of female singular 3PPs (excluding the *ko- and so-pronouns), onna, ano onna, kano onna and are, co-existed. In his later novels, however, *kanojo*, which appeared only twice in his early novels, established itself as the major female 3PP in narrative, ousting other forms, while *ano onna* is predominantly used in dialogue and occasionally in monologue. *Kano onna*, on the other hand, became archaic and is rarely used. Similarly, *are* retreated from human reference and is used predominantly for non-human reference.

### 8.6 Female 3PPs in *Kōjin*

#### 8.6.1 Variety of female third person reference in *Kōjin*

In Soseki’s early novels *kanojo* is used only for the main female characters (see section 8.4.2). However, HIGA in Table 8-7 showed the expanding use of *kanojo* with a variety of referents. The range of referents is further expanded in KOJI (1913) as shown in Table 8-10 below.

KOJI is a first person novel narrated by Jirō who is single and works at an architect’s
office. Jirō has an older brother, Ichirō, who is a university lecturer, and a younger sister, Shige. Ichirō is married to Nao (mostly referred to as kanojo) who is younger than Jirō whom she had known before marrying Ichirō. The marriage between Ichirō and Nao is shaky and Ichirō suspects that Nao may be in love with Jirō, who in turn is unsure about his feelings. The four reside in an extended family household which includes the parents and Ichirō’s and Nao’s daughter, Yoshie. Jirō has a friend called Misawa who falls ill while in Osaka and is hospitalised. At the hospital, Jirō and Misawa come across a geisha (ano onna) whom Misawa met a few days earlier. On his visit to the hospital, Jirō often talks with Misawa about the geisha, who is seriously ill and unlikely to live much longer. A good-looking nurse (kano onna/kanojo) is in charge of her. Before Misawa heads off to Tokyo, he tells a story of a mentally disturbed girl (sono musume san) whom his family looked after for a while before her death and who used to show an affection for him. Misawa tells Jirō that the geisha reminds him of that girl. Back in Tokyo, Jirō’s father tells a story of his acquaintance (otoko) and a woman (onna) with whom he (the acquaintance) once had an affair and accidentally meets 20 years later. He recognizes her but she does not because she has lost her eyesight. He feels guilty for his betrayal of her and asks Jirō’s father to visit her and persuade her to accept some money in compensation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>character</th>
<th>彼女 kanojo</th>
<th>彼女 kano onna</th>
<th>あの女 ano onna</th>
<th>女 onna</th>
<th>その女 sono onna</th>
<th>あれ are</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nao</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shige</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sada</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirō’s mother</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshie</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a blind woman</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jirō’s dating partner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misawa’s nurse</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>musume</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17+19*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a maid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geisha’s nurse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misawa’s mother</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geisha</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*sono musume san

Table 8-10 Kanojo and other female 3PPs in Kojin (1913)

Twelve female characters in KOJI are referred to as kanojo. By comparison, 彼女 annotated as kano onna has only one token. There are still some cases of the
pronominal use of *onna*. The referents of *onna* here, however, remain anonymous and the other use of *onna* (in post-identity revelation) as seen in SAN is not found in KOJI. In other words, once the name of a character is known, either her personal name or *kanojo* is used to refer to her. All these factors indicate that in KOJI, the annotation of 彼女 is almost consolidated to *kanojo* and *kanojo* established itself as a proper third person pronoun in Soseki’s novels that can refer to anyone.

There is another significant pattern in Soseki’s use of various 3PPs in KOJI. Several female characters that play key roles in the novel are always referred to *kanojo*. On the other hand, some other nameless characters whose stories are inserted in various parts of the novel have a different type of the 3PP assigned to each, in addition to occasional use of *kanojo*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Main 3pp</th>
<th>Token</th>
<th>Other terms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nao</td>
<td><em>kanojo</em></td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>musume</em></td>
<td><em>sono musume san</em></td>
<td>19</td>
<td><em>sono onna 17</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>geisha</em></td>
<td><em>ano onna</em></td>
<td>103</td>
<td><em>onna 14 are 2</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A blind woman</td>
<td><em>onna</em></td>
<td>42</td>
<td><em>sono onna 16</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misawa’s nurse</td>
<td><em>kanojo</em></td>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>kano onna 1</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8-11 shows the different terms of reference attributed to each of the five female characters in KOJI. Although there are some overlaps, the pattern of the use is strong enough to be considered as a conscious choice rather than mere coincidence. For instance, the main female character, Nao, is always referred to as *kanojo* apart from the use of the personal name, Nao, and relational names, *nēsan* (elder sister) and *sai* (wife). The girl (*musume*) who appears in Misawa’s story is most of the time referred to as *sono musumesan* or *sono onna*, the geisha as *ano onna*, the blind woman as *onna*, and the nurse as *kanojo* and *kano onna*. The unusually high number of tokens of the *so*-pronoun at 84 and *a*-pronoun at 119 in this novel, the highest of all novels, (see Table 6-2, Chapter 6) suggest that these women’s names are deliberately suppressed, in order to make full use of the deictic and demonstrative functions of *so* and *a*.
8.6.2 *Sono* and *ano* in Kōjin

KOJI demonstrates specific uses of *sono* (onna) and *ano* (onna) along with more generalized use of *kanojo* referring to a variety of characters. Okumura (1954: 63) qualified the former as a traditional Japanese 3PP, which predominantly appears in dialogue (see 6.2.2). This section will investigate the uses of *sono* and *ano* in KOJI with a view to highlighting their functions, which, in turn, will help us understand why *kanojo* always appears in narrative in Soseki’s novels. Table 8-12 is a relationship diagram of people in dialogue and their referents, and female 3PPs used in KOJI. The clear background indicates that the character does not know the referent well, while shaded background means that the character knows the referent well. An arrow indicates that the speaker is referring to the person pointed to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/L</th>
<th>3PP</th>
<th>Referent</th>
<th>3PP</th>
<th>S/L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td><em>Jirō</em></td>
<td><em>musume</em></td>
<td><em>ano</em></td>
<td>Misawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sono</em> musumesan</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td><em>Jirō</em></td>
<td><em>musume</em></td>
<td><em>ano</em></td>
<td>Ichirō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sono</em> musumesan</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td><em>Jirō/Ichirō</em></td>
<td><em>blind woman</em></td>
<td><em>ano</em></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sono</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td><em>Otokō</em></td>
<td><em>blind woman</em></td>
<td><em>ano</em></td>
<td>Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sono</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td><em>Jirō</em></td>
<td><em>geisha</em></td>
<td><em>ano</em></td>
<td>Misawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>ano</em> onna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shaded background: the person knows the referent well.
Clear background: the person does not know the referent.
S: the speaker, L: the listener.

In A, when Misawa tells the story of ‘*sono* musume san (that girl)’ with whom he had been emotionally involved, she is new to Jirō. Similarly, in D, Jirō’s father did not know ‘*sono* onna (that [blind] woman)’ when his friend first told him about his old flame. In turn, when the father tells the blind woman’s story to his sons in C, he has already met her but they hear it for the first time. On the other hand, when Jirō and Ichirō talk about ‘*sono* onna/*sono* musume san’ in B, they have heard about her but not met her. Thus, in A, B, C and D, *sono* is used when only one of the people (the speaker or the addressee) who are involved in a conversation knows the referent well, or neither of them knows the referent well. By comparison, in E ‘*ano* onna’ is used after both Jirō and Misawa have met the geisha, although, Misawa’s relationship to her is stronger than that of Jirō.
To summarise, in dialogue in KOJI:

- *sono* is used when only one of the parties knows the referent, or when neither of the parties knows the referent.
- *ano* is used when both parties know the referent.

These uses of *sono* and *ano* in KOJI suggests that *so* does not necessarily require a knowledge of the referent but *a* requires a mutual knowledge of the referent between the speaker and the addressee. This latter requirement explains why *a* is not rarely used in narrative where anonymous narrator addresses to anonymous readers. The difference between *so* and *a* was earlier demonstrated in Table 6-2 in 6.2.4, with *so* appearing more (65%) in narrative and *a* more (78%) in dialogue. This suggests that the increased uses of *kare* and *kanojo* were also supported by the *a*-pronoun's inability to shift from dialogue to narrative because of its requirement of mutual knowledge of the referent.

8.6.3 *Kano onna* and *kanojo* in Kōjin

彼女 annotated as *kano onna* was becoming increasingly rare in Soseki's novels and the last appearance of it was in KOJI. This last and single appearance of *kano onna* in KOJI could be dismissed or overlooked as an accident or a typological error as Koike (1994: 77) did. However, in his letter (dated 12/11/1913, source: Soseki zenshū vol. 15, p. 294) to his proof-reader, Uchida Eizo, Soseki wrote: there are some 彼女 annotated as “*kanojo*” and others as ‘*kano onna*’. This note shows that Soseki consciously differentiated *kano onna* from *kanojo*.

Example (15) is the paragraph in KOJI where *kano onna* appears.

(15) 三澤はすべて斬りふせの内幕の出所をみんな彼の看護婦に録して、ことごとく彼女（かのをんな）から聞いた様に説明した。けれども自分は少し共感に疑はしい点を認めないでもなかった。自分は三澤が便所へ行った留守に、看護婦を捕まえて、「三澤はあ、云つてい るが、俺の居ないとき、あの女の室へ行って話でもするんじゃないか」と聞いて見た。看護婦は真面目な顔をして「そんな事ありやしまへん」といふような言葉で、一口に自分の 親が否定した。彼女（かのじょ）は夫から左多ふお客が見舞いに行った所で、身上話などが出来る苦がないと解釈した。

(Kōjin, Shoëisha series, 1981: 71)

Misawa explained all these private details to me as if his nurse was the source of the gossip and [he] heard them from her. However, I could not say that I entirely believed his words. While Misawa left for the toilets, I got hold of the nurse and said, “Misawa doesn’t say so, but hasn’t he been to that woman’s room and been talking to her while I’ve been away?” The nurse looked serious and denied my accusation without hesitation, saying something like “Such
things don’t happen”. She then added that she [the geisha] is not fit enough to talk even if she had such a visitor.

Two women, Misawa’s nurse and a geisha, are referred to in this paragraph. The first 彼女 (kano onna) refers to the nurse but to whom the second 彼女 (kanojo) refers is more ambiguous. There are two possible interpretations for this kanojo as shown below.

(16a) 彼女は夫から[左右いふお客が見舞いに行った所で、身上話などが出来る筈がない]と解

Kanojo wa sorekara [sōiu okyaku ga mimai ni itta tokorode, minouebanashi nado ga dekiru hazu ga nai] to benkaishita.
(She (nurse) then added that [(the geisha) is not fit enough to talk even if such a visitor went into her room].)

(16b) 彼女は夫から左右いふお客が見舞いに行った所で、身上話などが出来る筈がない]と解

[Kanojo wa sorekara sōiu okyaku ga mimai ni itta tokorode, minouebanashi nado ga dekiru hazu ga nai] to benkaishita.
(The nurse) added [that she (geisha) is not fit enough to talk even if such a visitor went into her room.]

Example (16a) interprets kanojo as referring to the nurse and Example (16b) the geisha. Either is equally possible. However, the existence of ‘夫から sorekara (then)’ after kanojo suggests that (16a) may be the more natural interpretation than (16b). If that is the case, 彼女 in (16a) and (16b) both refer to the same person (the nurse). Then why did Soseki instruct two different annotations, kano onna and kanojo, for 彼女 here? Before answering the question, we will look at another example concerning 彼女 in KOJI.

(17) 母は又行李の中へ、こまごましたものを出したり入れたりし始めた。自分は今度は彼の女

(Kōjin, Shueisha series, 1981: 221)

My mother resumed packing, putting things in and taking things out of the luggage. Conscious of her (my mother’s) presence, this time, I didn’t dare to look at my sister-in-law’s face. Even then, I felt a cold shadow of a smile on her (my sister-in-law’s) youthful, sad lips pass in front of my eyes.

彼女 and 彼女 in Example (17) are both annotated as kanojo. The first kanojo refers to Jirō’s mother and the second, Jirō’s sister-in-law. Why are these two instances of kanojo written differently? Soseki does not mention these variations in his letter to Uchida (the proof-reader). However, Soseki is known to be particular about his
choice of characters. In another letter to Uchida (dated 12/7/1913, Soseki zenshū vol. 15, p. 305), Soseki instructs him to differentiate the two first person pronouns (the equivalent of English I), 姉 (atashi) from 私 (watashī). Without annotations, both characters can be read as watashī. In Kōjin, 姉 appears in the speech of Nao (Jirō’s sister-in-law) and Shige (Jirō’s younger sister). Soseki uses 姉 to capture the speech of young Tokyo women, and 私 for more formal expression. Judging by this and other detailed instructions in his letter, it is unlikely that the two forms of kanojo in Example (17) are accidents. Instead, it is more likely that Soseki used different forms for different people in order to avoid misunderstanding.

Similarly, Soseki pays attention to differentiating the three nurses who appear in hospital scenes. These are A. Misawa’s nurse, B. the geisha’s nurse and C. an anonymous nurse. A is consistently referred to as kangofu (nurse) and C as byōin no kangofu (hospital nurse), as shown in Example (19) below.

[The nurse sometimes laughed, saying that the way A wiggled to the toilets was funny. And then, she said that she has seen a hospital nurse enter A’s room with a cloth and a wash-basin a few times.]

B is often referred to with demonstratives, kono, sono and ano before nurse, as kono kangofu (this nurse), sono kangofu (that nurse) and ano kangofu (that nurse), and sometimes an adjective such as ‘beautiful’ is inserted between the demonstrative and kangofu. Kanojo is used for both A and B but only after the narrator (Jirō) gets to know them personally and when they appear independently. When the two nurses are in one scene, each of them is always referred to differently as in Example (19).

(19) この美しい看護婦 [kono utsukushii kangofu] から自分は運勢を観たらしい、玩具の古い本に聞いた様なことを借りて、三沢の室でそれを遊んで遊んだ。（...）
[I borrowed some sort of fortune telling game from this beautiful nurse and played it in Misawa’s room. (...) The nurse showed us how to play, counting how many red and how many black stones I had got, and then read my fortune.]

Kono utsukushii kangofu (this beautiful nurse) is B (the geisha’s nurse) and kangofu (the nurse) and kanojo (she) are A (Misawa’s nurse). At first glance, both references
in Example (19) seem to point to B. But two things suggest otherwise: a) the fact that they play a fortune telling game in Misawa’s room, and b) Misawa, later in the novel (p. 67), says that he has never spoken to B. It is unlikely that the geisha’s nurse to whom Misawa has never spoken neglects her charge and goes into his room to play a fortune telling game. Therefore, it is natural to think that the two tokens of ‘nurse’ in (19) are meant for two different nurses.

All the evidence—the two forms of kanojo (彼の女 for Jirō’s mother and 彼女 for Nao); the conscious use of 奪 (atashi) and 私 (watakushi); and the different references for three nurses—suggest that 彼女 (kano onna) and 彼女 (kanojo) in Example (15) refer to two different nurses rather than one.

In summary, the frequent use of kanojo written as 彼女 (280 tokens) and variety of its referents (12 female characters) in KOJI confirm that kanojo is well established as the main female 3PP in Soseki’s writing. And the variation in annotation (kano onna) and in form (彼の女) are used when differentiation of multiple female characters in one scene is needed to avoid confusion. Soseki’s conscious use of different forms and annotations is also evident in his instructions to his proofreader. What is significant here is that Soseki did not consider the option of personal names for third person reference in these situations as he might have done in his earlier novels. Instead, he chose to use 彼女 most of the time in KOJI and made an effective use of its variations where differentiation of multiple characters was necessary. However, this kind of differentiation disappears after KOJI and only one form, 彼女, and sound, kanojo, are used for any female character in his later novels, KOKO, MICH and MEI. This, in turn, confirms the final stage of specialization of kanojo as an established female third person pronoun in Soseki’s writing.

8.7 Conclusion

Following the Edo tradition, kare continued to be used for both male and female referents until the late 19th century. Around that time, 彼女 (kanojo) began to be used regularly as a female 3PP. The formative process of kanojo is demonstrated by the
co-existence of various forms and annotations in Soseki’s novels, especially in the first half of his career. Although, 彼女（kanojo）was the preferred form and annotation, various annotations of 彼女 as well as various forms of kanojo co-existed at that time not only in Soseki’s but also other writers’ novels, indicating a transitional process.

The broadening referent range of kanojo from the main heroine only to any female character is observed in Soseki’s novels. Throughout Soseki’s novels, 彼女 progressed: from the 3PP for non-specific references (human & plant) to be used exclusively for heroines, and then, finally to be used for any individual woman in the novel, including one’s own mother. Thus, the final stage of assimilation of kanojo into Soseki’s writing as a female 3PP was achieved in Higansugimade.

However, in HIGA, seven tokens of 彼女（kano onna）co-exist with 彼女（kanojo）. The complete shift from kano onna to kanojo occurred a few years later in Soseki’s last three novels. The fourth novel from the last, KOJI (1913), well illustrates the process of consolidation of various female 3PPs to one form, 彼女（kanojo）, and the specialized uses of kano onna and ano onna. The frequent use of kanojo written as 彼女 (278 tokens) and the variety of its referents (12 female characters) in KOJI confirm that kanojo is well established as the main female 3PP in Soseki’s writing. And the variation in annotation (kano onna) and form (彼の女) are used when differentiation of multiple female characters in one scene is needed to avoid confusion.
Chapter 9
Soseki and other Meiji/Taisho writers

9.1 Introduction

Chapters 4-8 investigated changes in Soseki’s use of personal pronouns and found:

- a dramatic frequency increase, especially in the first person pronoun (1PP) and third person pronoun (3PP).
- a predominant use of *kare* 3PPs (*kare, kanojo* and *karera*) in narrative.
- the appearance and increased frequency of *kanojo* (*she*).
- a change in the use of 3PPs from very specific to more general.
- the co-existence of a variety of forms and annotations for *kare* and *kanojo* in his earlier novels.

This chapter will examine one aspect of the above changes, the frequency increase of the *kare* 3PPs, and ask three questions by comparing the results from Chapters 4-8 with the pronoun use of Soseki’s fellow writers. First, is the dramatic increase of the *kare* 3PPs unique to Soseki or more widespread? Second, if the latter, is it possible to determine when the changes occurred – for example, when did *kare* settle as the main male singular 3PP? Third, what do these changes in personal pronouns mean in the wider literary and linguistic context?

The idea is to deduce some patterns (diachronic changes) from a large volume of texts. For the main analysis, writers are chosen on the following basis of the following criteria:

- they were Soseki’s contemporaries
- their novels are available in electronic form
- they were responsible for a large volume of writing over an extended period.
This resulted in the following writers being chosen for investigation:

Mori Ogai (1862-1922)
Natsume Soseki (1867-1916)
Nagai Kafū (1879-1959)
Tanizaki Junichirō (1886-1965)
Shiga Naoya (1883-1971)

The major works of Soseki, and some of the works of Ogai and Shiga are available on Shinchōsha’s three CD-ROMs with concordance software. Online collections supply some others that are not on the CD-ROMs (see Appendix C for details of the source texts).

9.2 Profiles of writers

First, the five writers’ linguistic and literary backgrounds are examined before exploring possible connections between these and their pronoun use.

9.2.1 Linguistic background

Table 9-1 shows the lives and careers of the above writers. The parts in orange indicate their writing careers, those in grey the non-writing and the one in light grey non-novel production period(s) of their lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9-1 Lives and careers of Meiji/Taisho writers</th>
<th>non-writing</th>
<th>no novels</th>
<th>writing career</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1860s</td>
<td>1870s</td>
<td>1880s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafū</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanizaki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiga</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edo 1603-1867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meiji 1868-1912</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taisho 1912-1926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōwa 1926-1989</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ogai and Soseki are the only ones who were born in the Edo period (1603–1867) and died before the Shōwa period (1926–1989). Kafū, Tanizaki and Shiga were all born in the Meiji period and their career spanned the three periods, Meiji, Taishō (1912–1926) and Shōwa. It also shows Soseki’s late start as a writer and his extremely short career compared to other writers. Ogai had an 18-year break from novel writing between 1891 and 1909 after the successful publication of his three novellas based in Germany (*German Trilogy*). This issue will be further examined in section 9.3.2.

The five writers can be grouped into three categories, according to age; A – Ogai and Soseki (born in the 1860s), B – Kafū (born in the 1870s) and C – Tanizaki and Shiga (born in the 1880s). This grouping coincides with the types of language education they received as shown in Table 9-2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Writers</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>University major</th>
<th>Foreign languages</th>
<th>Overseas experience</th>
<th>Method of reading foreign literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ogai, Soseki</td>
<td>Chinese studies (<em>kangaku</em>) +</td>
<td>Ogai – medicine</td>
<td>Ogai – German</td>
<td>Ogai (4 yrs in</td>
<td>Read the originals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>European Languages</td>
<td>Soseki – English</td>
<td>Soseki – English</td>
<td>Germany)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 yrs in America</td>
<td>In translation and some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and 1 yr in France</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ogai, Soseki</td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>(English/French)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kafū</td>
<td>Mainly Japanese</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English at high school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shiga, Tanizaki</td>
<td>Mainly Japanese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ogai and Soseki received traditional *kangaku* (Chinese studies) education from very early age, were able to read and write in *kanbun* (Chinese writing) with ease and enjoyed composing Chinese poems. At the same time they belonged to the small number of students who received European language education by native speakers in the early part of the Meiji period before Japanese teachers displaced them. Ogai’s German and Soseki’s English were said to be of a high standard (Miyoshi 1983: 14, Kuramoto 1980: 86, Kubo 1977: 198).
Kafū’s father was an accomplished Chinese poet and his mother’s father was a Confucian scholar. However Kafū himself did not have much passion for kanbun and did not study it. This was largely because of the social climate (kanbun was on the decline) and his own fascination with French literature, but can also be interpreted as his reaction against his father and kanbun as the representative of him and his generation¹. He studied French at an evening school for a while but his language skills were mainly acquired during his stay in America (four years) and France (one year). However, on his return to Japan, he quickly lost enthusiasm for European literature, and indulged in his reminiscence of Edo gesaku (popular fiction), especially ninjōbon (romance).

Tanizaki did not learn kanbun in his early childhood. Although he took Chinese reading lessons when he was 14, the breadth and depth of his knowledge were no comparison to Ogai and Soseki. His major at the university was Japanese literature, which he did not complete. Shiga also did not receive much kanbun education. At the university he majored in English but soon transferred to Japanese. In other words, neither Tanizaki nor Shiga received sufficient education in either kanbun or Western languages to really understand them and Japanese was their only means of reading and writing to them.

How each of these authors read foreign literature can be guessed by checking their libraries, notes and diaries. Both Ogai and Soseki owned a large number of foreign language books with some notations of their own, indicating that they read the originals (Kuramoto 1980: 87-8). Their notes and diaries also often contain entries in English (Soseki) and German (Ogai). While Kafū may have had a good command of spoken English and French, his understanding of foreign languages and literature was not as profound as that of Ogai and Soseki. He may have translated a few novels from French, but his years of language education and breadth of reading were limited. Tanizaki and Shiga, who had neither kanbun nor European language education beyond the normal school curriculum, are most likely to have read foreign literature in translation. There are

¹ Kafū’s feeling towards his father and his generation is expressed in his Shinkichōsha no nikki (A Diary of A Newly-returned, 1909). In this essay, he complains of the difficulty of deciphering his father’s old-fashioned letter to him written in the Chinese style with a brush, the trouble he has to go through in writing a reply and his embarrassment with his own poor hand-writing (p. 180).
some scholars, such as Nozaki (2003), who argue against this view and elevate Tanizaki’s language abilities to the level of extreme fluency on the basis of his translated works of Pierre Baudelaire, Thomas Hardy, Oscar Wild and Stendhal. However, Tanizaki employed scholars and translators, such as Sawada Takuya, for most of his translation projects and his role was more to do with polishing the drafts in a manner that suited his taste (Inoue 2004).

In summary, each ‘generation’ has decreasing linguistic ability and is increasingly reliant on translation as a source of literary information.

9.2.2 Literary background
According to their literary styles, the five writers can be grouped slightly differently. Ogai and Soseki are known for their intellectual vigour and independent stance, which distanced them from the mainstream naturalist circle, and are often referred to as “Richiha” (the intellectual school). Ogai studied the major German authors such as Lessing, Schiller, Goethe, Hoffman and Wagner, and insisted on the necessity of ideals in literary works. Each of his German trilogy, Maihime (1890, The Dancing Girl), Utakata no ki (1890, The Mirage) and Fumizukai (1891, The Letter Carrier), is a parody and criticism of existing European literary thinking or an expression of his ideals; rejection of Richard Wagner’s fascination with Death in Love, disapproval of Ivan Turgenev’s sympathy with Bakunin’s anarchism, and promotion of Goethe’s spirit of “labour and renunciation”, respectively (Nakai 1983: 252). For this reason, he was strongly against ‘realists’ in literature such as Emile Zola and his followers in Japan, who formed the influential naturalist school.

Soseki, on the other hand, successfully combined realism and imaginative elements in his novels. However, because of his flair for the dramatic story line and capacity to entertain readers, he was sometimes regarded, from the purists’ (naturalists’) point of view, as a popular writer by his contemporaries. In spite of this criticism, Soseki was interested in the new literary generation and supported the members of the Shirakaba school, to which Shiga belonged, and young writers such as Akutagawa Ryūnosuke
(1892–1927) and Kume Masao (1891–1952). Soseki’s second last novel, *Michikusa*, is his only autobiographical novel and shows strong Japanese Naturalist characteristics.

Kafū was first famous for his Zola-inspired realist stories but later developed nostalgia for Edo fiction, advocated aestheticism in literature against naturalist novels, and produced a series of stories based in pleasure quarters inspired by *ninjōhon* (love stories of Edo people often involving courtesans and geisha) with shades of romanticism. Tanizaki was a natural successor of Kafū (his passionate review of Tanizaki’s early stories single-handedly turned an unknown writer into a literary figure) and further pursued themes inspired by women’s sensuality and beauty, and men’s erotic obsession with them.

Shiga is widely regarded as the perfecter of the *watakushi shōsetsu* (personal novels often translated as *I-*novels), which is the end product of naturalist fiction with strong confessional overtone. He was a member of the *Shirakaba* (White Birch) school which consists of a group of upper middle class writers who came from the prestigious Gakushūin (the Peer’s) University and wrote for the journal, *Shirakaba* (1910–1923). They embraced Tolstoy’s idealistic humanism and during their heyday, had great influence on young writers. Although they attacked the naturalists’ gloomy defeatism, they too, produced confessional stories about themselves and their in-group, only thinly disguised by the use of third person pronouns. However, because of the confessional nature of their novels, many failed to find something new to say in their later years. Shiga was no exception. What is important about the *Shirakaba* school for this thesis is their use of the 3PP, *kare*, in the place of *I*, and that of the past tense, *ta* ending.

In summary, Ogai and Soseki were largely independent of the mainstream literary schools and maintained their own literary ideals supported by their profound knowledge of both *kanbun* and Western literature. Ogai was openly against naturalism and Soseki sceptical of it. By comparison, Kafū started as a naturalist writer but later turned to romanticism and assisted Tanizaki’s debut to the literary scene. Tanizaki further developed his aesthetic romanticism and created richly imaginative novels. Shiga, on the
other hand, belonged to the idealistic Shirakaba school and kept writing confessional
stories, often using the 3PP, *kare*, instead of writing the narrative in first person.

With these backgrounds in mind, the following sections will examine the use of 3PPs in
their writing.

9.3 Frequencies of *kare* type pronouns in five writers' novels

9.3.1 Corpus investigation

This section will investigate the frequencies of the *kare* type pronouns in the works of
the five writers: for the comparison, 91 novels are examined. The term ‘novel’ is used
very loosely here for two reasons. First, although the Japanese novel is different from
the Western novel, a new term might simply cause unfamiliarity and confusion. I am
aware of the scholars who are strongly opposed to the use of ‘novel’ for Japanese prose
fiction. As Miyoshi (1974: xvi) notes, “The Japanese novel (...) does not conform to the
specifications of the Western novel on which it is modelled”. Attempts have been made
to give a new name to the Japanese novel. For example, Fujii (1993: 2) calls it ‘prose
narrative’ to distinguish it from the Western ‘novel’. However, this term simply creates
another confusion with the existing ‘narrative’ as in ‘dialogue and narrative’. Second,
the Japanese novel tends to be shorter than its Western counterpart. Some of the writers
(e.g. Shiga) did not produce any novel-length pieces during the period that has been
investigated. In fact, it is difficult to find a Japanese writer who consistently produced
novel-length pieces apart from Soseki. For these two reasons, this thesis uses the term
‘novel’ for the Japanese novel, including short stories.

The sources and details of the texts are shown in Appendix C. Soseki’s novels are the
same ones used in the previous chapters (From NEKO to MEI plus the first London
*shōsoku* (LON1) written in London). Ōgai’s short stories are grouped together according
to the year of production and Shiga’s are grouped five-yearly, due to their extremely
short length – many of Shiga’s stories are very short, often less than ten pages. The
tokens of *kare* type pronouns are counted using the key word search function attached to
the CD-ROMs, or other search software for the texts that are not on the CD-ROMs. Pronouns in the texts without electronic format are counted manually.

Table 9-3 shows the frequencies of the *kare* type in these writers’ texts during the Meiji and Taishō periods. Though Kafū, Shiga and Tanizaki continued to write in the Shōwa period, figures from that period are not included in the table, since the main aim is the comparison of them with Soseki and also because the Shōwa period is out of the scope of this study. Figures are adjusted to the ratio of 100,000 characters for comparison. Charts 9-A and 9-B in the following sections are added in order to see the patterns of the change graphically. Chart 9-A compares Ogai and Kafū with Soseki and Chart 9-B Shiga and Tanizaki with Soseki. Both charts are based on the figures in Table 9-3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1902</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1916</th>
<th>1917</th>
<th>1918</th>
<th>1921</th>
<th>1924</th>
<th>1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ogai</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kafū</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soseki</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>789</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiga</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>385*</td>
<td>373*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanizaki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* An average of five years’ work.

Ogai and Kafū start with high frequencies of the *kare* type pronoun early in their careers at 168 and 165 respectively, but they quickly decrease and stay very low. In Soseki’s case, a dramatic increase halfway through his career is observed (see Chapter 5 for detailed analysis). This time his earlier essay, *London shōsoku* (1902), shown in bold in the table, was added to the table and it shows a higher frequency than his first four novels. By comparison, Shiga and Tanizaki’s frequency rates are more consistent and mostly stay between 300 and 450.

9.3.2 Soseki, Ogai and Kafū

*Corpus analysis*

Chart 9-A displays the patterns of the *kare* type 3PP use of Ogai, Kafū and Soseki and it shows an interesting contrast between Soseki and the rest. They all start with similar
frequency levels at around 150, followed by a steady decrease. However, Soseki’s frequency takes off after 1908 and with the exception of 1914 (Note: this novel, Kokoro, is written in first person and a large part of it is a letter), it continues to increase until its peak at 1058 in 1915 (Michikusa - Grass on the Wayside). Although his final novel in 1916 (Meian – Light and Darkness) shows some decrease, its frequency (789) is still high. By comparison, both Ogai and Kafū demonstrate very low frequencies (less than 35) after their second novels and never really take off again. These are the individual characteristics of their pronoun use and the patterns of the change that can be detected from the frequency chart.

Chart 9-A Frequencies of kare 3PPs in Ogai, Kafū and Soseki’s works (/100k characters)

Qualitative analysis
The uniform decrease of the kare type frequencies in the second novels of all three of these writers implies some sort of change in their writing style and attitudes. Their first works, Ogai’s German trilogy – Maihime, Utakata no ki, and Fumidukai, Kafū’s Amerika monogatari (American Stories) and Soseki’s London shōsoku (Letters from London), which score remarkably similar frequencies of the kare type, are all based in foreign countries, Germany, America and England, respectively. Two of them (Amerika monogatari and London shōsoku) are even written while Kafū and Soseki were overseas.
Their second novels, which followed after their return to Japan, show similar decrease in frequency. Soseki’s *Wagahai wa neko dearu* (*I Am A Cat*, 1905), which is often believed to have a high frequency of personal pronouns, has only half the frequency of London’s *shōsoku* (1902). Kafū’s *Furansu monogatari* (*French Stories*, 1908), which is also based in a foreign country but written in Japan, shows much lower frequency. In Ogai’s case, the second novel, other than poems and translations, had to wait for 18 years before its appearance and it too shows much lower frequency.

One possible explanation for the high frequencies in their first novels is that because they were writing in foreign countries (Kafū and Soseki) or the stories are based in foreign soil (Ogai) under the influence of Western languages, they unconsciously used the *kare* type more often than they might have than when they were in Japan. The frequency decrease in their writing after their return to Japan suggests that this theory might be correct.

**Frustration of Ogai and Kafū**

Then why was it that their patterns of use took different directions thereafter? There must have been a reason. Each author’s style of writing could hold the key to the answer. Ogai’s German trilogy is written in *gabuntai* (elegant Japanese style), which is described as a new style bridging the formal *kanbun* (Chinese writing) and *wabun* (traditional Japanese writing). Noguchi (1994: 140-4) explains that Ogai, who grew up with *kanbun* with its restricted sentence endings, found it insufficient to express the kind of lyricism he wanted in his contemporary German stories. He adopted the traditional Japanese style, which allowed him to use various perfective ending forms that could convey the emotions of the first person narrator. At the same time, *wabun* alone, with its limited vocabulary, could not express many modern and foreign situations and for these, *kango* (Chinese words) had to be used. Ogai’s profound knowledge and understanding of *kanbun* made it possible for him to choose the right terms that would fit well in a traditional Japanese writing style. Ogai’s *gabuntai* is a remarkable achievement in its own right and is, by no means, a backward-looking experiment. Young Soseki saw this at once and explained why, in his letter to a friend and haiku poet, Masaoka Shiki:
Soseki (dated 3/8/1891, 1966. *Soseki zenshū*, vol. 14, p. 33) wrote, Ogai’s short stories “have structures based on Western literature, thoughts on his learning, and sentences on both *kanbun* and *wabun*”. Soseki’s insight came from his own learning and understanding of these various types of writing.

Ogai’s new style could have survived if the Edo tradition had continued and formal writing persisted. However, in spite of the literary acclaim won by his German trilogy, this style had its own limitations. First, it required a good knowledge of *kanbun* and *wabun* to read, let alone, to write. Since the beginning of the Meiji period, both *kanbun* and *wabun* were on the decline and the young generation of readers were less equipped to deal with them (Nozaki 1927: 315). Second, during Ogai’s absence in Germany, the first Japanese colloquial novel, Futabatei Shime’s *Ukigumo* (*The Drifting Clouds*), was published in 1887, and since then the colloquial style had fast been becoming the main stream. Ogai, in a sense, missed the boat and his frustration is expressed in the form of his criticism of the colloquial style exercised by his fellow writers (1890: 45-6). He saw vulgar connotations in the new sentence endings, such as *dearu, da, and desu*, used by *genbunitchi* writers and was dissatisfied with the standard of the new writing, although he himself could not present a better example. He experimented with colloquial writing in his translations between 1888 and 1889 just after his return to Japan, but following the publication of his German trilogy (1890), colloquial writing was completely dropped and *gabuntai* became his main style (Isogai 1979: 53).

Ogai’s long silence following the German trilogy is often discussed in connection with his two frontline duties as a medical officer in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-5) and the Russo-Japanese War (1904-5), and his posting in Kokura, in Kyūshū. There is no denying that these were great disruptions for his writing, but there is a strong indication that the shift from a formal writing style to a colloquial one, especially after creating a new elegant style in German trilogy, was difficult, and Ogai needed an incubation period. The fact that Ogai kept creating other types of writing such as diaries in traditional Japanese verse, Chinese poems and translations in *gabuntai* even in war zones in China, shows that he was not completely inactive in his literary production.
Only novels written in a colloquial style were missing. When Ogai finally wrote a colloquial style story, *Hanjitsu* (*Half a Day*, 1909), it coincided with his return to Tokyo from Kokura. However, he was never a master of this style and quickly turned his attention to historical novels, which do not require the expression of modern feelings.

Similarly, Kafū’s *Amerika monogatari* and *Furansu monogatari* were not entirely written in a colloquial style: both have some parts written in *gabuntai*. While overseas, he had freedom to write in his own style and on his own subject. On his return to Japan, a number of his novels, including *Furansu monogatari*, were prohibited from being sold. Consequently, the disillusioned Kafū became more and more immersed in a nostalgic pursuit of Edo culture, including his choice of models reminiscent of Yoshiwara courtesans portrayed in a lively fashion in Edo romance stories (*ninjōbon*). Thus, both Ogai and Kafū turned their back to the modern novel and returned to the old and familiar territories. Their infrequent use of the *kare* type of pronoun illustrates this.

**Soseki’s third person narrative**

Soseki, on the other hand, in spite of being educated in *kanbun*, never wrote his novels in a formal style. In 1908 he wrote “from now on, it is most appropriate to use a simple *genbunitchi* style which is based on the Tokyo dialect in order to write a novel suitable for modern civilisation” (quoted in Miura 1956: 150). This indicates his awareness of the future of Japanese novels in a colloquial style. However, he did not immediately take on the past tense, which was familiar to him through his academic research into 19th century English literature. As was the case in Ogai’s deliberate use of formal *gabuntai* in his German trilogy, Soseki initially resisted the overwhelming tide of modern novels with the past tense, as demonstrated in NEKO (see 4.3.2).

While the choice of a narrative style may generally be dependent on the subject matter and authors’ intentions, this was not the case in the Meiji period. The search for a new type of narrator and narrative, which enabled writers to experiment with new expressions and structures suitable for a new ‘novel’ genre, was a serious issue. The distinction between the first person and third person that exists in European languages is
not obvious in Japanese and it only becomes visible when the ‘person’ is stressed by using personal pronouns or other forms of expression. This stressing of the ‘person’ became commonplace in the Meiji period (Komori 1988a: 32). It was initiated with the first person in the early Meiji 20s (1887-1896) (Komori 1988a: 356). Ogai’s German trilogy is a good example of such experiments in first person narrative writing. However, his experiments in writing never reached the third person. Karatani (1992: 239-240) suggests that there is a conceptual gap between the first and third person narrative, which can only be overcome by the use of the past tense *ta* and the 3PP *kare*. Futabatei achieved the former but failed to adopt the latter in *Ukigumo*, and Ogai adopted the *yomihon* style use of *kare* but failed to modernise his sentence endings.

By comparison, Soseki’s later novels demonstrate his mastery of third person narrative. The increased frequencies of the past tense *ta* and the *kare* type 3PPs in his novels from SORE (1909) onwards, coincide with his use of the third person narrative: the connection between these has already been explored in Chapter 4. Karatani (1994: 19-20) states that among Soseki’s novels, MICH is the first one written in a style that can strictly termed the objective third person narrative style. He also adds that every other novel before this contains what he calls “the duality” characteristic of pre-modern fiction (e.g. multiple narrators, multiple viewpoints and multiple time). HIGA shifts between the first person and third person narrative several times throughout the novel. KOJI and KOKO, which appear to be written in first person narrative, demonstrate shifts of narrators and time and contain a number of insertions in the form of letters and recollections. The much-increased frequencies of the *kare* 3PPs in MICH support Karatani’s statement.

This is the fundamental difference that separates Soseki from Ogai and Kafū and the second reason for the two contrasting frequency curves in Chart 9-A. Ogai’s modern colloquial novels (as distinct from his historical colloquial novels) are mostly written in the first person. The only attempt to write in the third person, *Seinen* (*Young man*, 1910), which was inspired by the success of Soseki’s *Sanshirō* (1908), had to be given up half way through the story. Likewise, Kafū’s major works take the form of first person
narrative (e.g. *Amerika monogatari*, *Furansu monogatari* and *Bokuto kitan*). Ogai and Kafū never warmed to third person narrative or *kare* type pronouns in their writing.

### 9.3.3 Soseki, Shiga and Tanizaki

This section will compare Soseki’s use of the *kare* type pronouns with the second generation of Meiji writers, Shiga and Tanizaki and examine whether any distinct pattern is found.

#### Chart 9-B Frequencies of *kare* 3PPs: Soseki, Shiga and Tanizaki in the Meiji and Taishō periods (/100k characters)

![Chart 9-B Frequencies of *kare* 3PPs: Soseki, Shiga and Tanizaki in the Meiji and Taishō periods (/100k characters)](chart)

Chart 9-B shows the three writer’s use of the *kare* type pronouns in the Meiji and Taishō periods. Compared to Soseki, Shiga and Tanizaki display steadier frequencies, mostly hovering between 200 and 400 tokens per 100,000 characters. Their frequencies are lower than the highest of Soseki’s but much higher than those of Ogai and Kafū shown on Chart 9-A. They show neither the steep climb of Soseki’s nor the decline after the first foreign-based novels of Ogai and Kafū. What the relatively steady lines of their frequency rates show is the monolingualistic experience of their writing. The colloquial novel writing pioneered by Futabatei in 1887 was well established in the literary world by 1908 (Yamamoto 1977: 342). This means that even within their monolingualistic confinement, Shiga and Tanizaki were spared from the struggle for a new style of
writing. Unlike Ogai and Soseki who had multiple choices of Japanese writing styles in addition to the strong influence and confusion created by the influx of Western languages, by the time they started writing novels *genbunitchi* was the only choice. Further, their linguistic experiences were confined at this stage within the Tokyo dialect that had also established itself as the standard form of the Japanese language by then. In short, they simply followed the path laid by their predecessors and did not have the second language that might have caused some conflicts or changes in their writing style.

While Shiga and Tanizaki demonstrate consistent and relatively high frequencies, the rates are never nearly as high as those of Soseki’s last two novels, *Michikusa* (1915) and *Meian* (1916). The reason for this gap can be related to the process of grammaticalization and explained by analysing in detail the use of *kare* type pronouns.

### 9.4 Grammaticalization of *kare* 3PP

**9.4.1 Grammaticalization – definition**

In this thesis, grammaticalization is understood in a broader sense as change that gives rise to new grammatical categories (c.f. Kiparsky 2004), in this case, a new pronominal category: the *kare* type. Running the risk of over-simplifying a very complex process, I will attempt to briefly review the notion of grammaticalization (explained in more detail in Chapter 2 and 7) following Hopper and Traugott’s (2003: 116) description, “Grammaticalization as viewed from the diachronic perspective is (...) a unidirectional phenomenon”. “Unidirectionality” means that grammaticalization has a tendency to move in one direction but not in reverse. Normally it proceeds from a lexical item to a grammatical one, then to a clitic and finally to an inflectional affix in many languages (pp. 6-16). This process involves several stages, such as:

- generalization
- specialization
- decategorialization
- increase in grammatical status
- renewal
“Generalization” is the stage of lexical items taking on grammatical functions, being generalized, coming to be used in more and more contexts and eventually gaining wider distribution and meanings (P. 102). ‘Specialization’ is a kind of elimination process in which, as certain items become generalized in meaning and use, other forms in the same category become disused and disappear from speech or writing (p. 115). These two processes occur simultaneously and ensure the ‘increase in grammatical status’. Finally, as these generalized items become unmarked and lose their novelty, they could be “renewed as more expressive ways are found of saying the same thing” (P. 116). This is called ‘renewal’ and a new cycle of grammaticalization continues with the new items.

9.4.2 Application of grammaticalization

Chart 9-C is a simplified graph of the frequency curves that show the changing use of the kare type pronouns in the three groups of writers. The blue line indicates Ogai and Kafū, yellow Soseki, and pink Shiga and Tanizaki. For the first generation of the Meiji writers (Ogai, Soseki and Kafū), there were three hurdles to overcome in their careers. First was the Western experience and direct encounter with Western languages, second, the adoption of a modern colloquial writing and adaptation to it, and third, the incorporation and naturalization of third person narrative in their writing.

In their landmark text on grammaticalization, Hopper and Traugott (2003: 130) state that dramatic changes in grammaticalization are often discussed in terms of S-curves:

Sometimes a slowly emerging construction can be seen to take over very rapidly, perhaps at the expense of competing constructions, (...) Dramatic changes of this type are often discussed in terms of S-curves, that is, gradual beginnings, rapid spread, and gradual tapering off. To date, too few historical studies have been conducted to determine to what extent S-curves are the product of multiple correlated factors contributing to morphosyntactic change or individual localized changes, but it seems likely that they [S-curves] result from the former [multiple correlated factors].
Soseki’s pronoun use, shown in yellow in Chart 9-C, forms the S-curve: the initial encounter with the West and slow experiments of colloquial writing, adoption of third person narrative and rapid increase of the kare type pronouns, and finally, his mastery of third person narrative and the tapering off of the frequency of the kare 3PPs. In other words, during his short career (16 years) the grammaticalization of the kare type almost completed the full cycle, at least in his writing. At the same time, the three generations of writers on the chart could be seen to form another S-curve but stretched over a longer period: Ogai and Kafū’s reluctance to use the kare type represents the ‘gradual beginning’, the dramatic frequency increase in Soseki’s mid-career the ‘rapid spread’ or steep climb, and the relatively high and stable frequencies in Shiga’s and Tanizaki’s novels, the ‘tapering off’. These two S-curves demonstrate the complexity and multi-layered nature of grammaticalization, as well, of course as individual differences in the rate of change. Soseki’s curve appears extreme because it is so condensed. In reference to Hopper and Traugott’s hypothesis of S-curves resulting from multiple correlated factors, my investigation in the field of literature suggests that, in this context at least, they are the result of both multiple correlated factors and individual localised changes as represented by the three generations of writers in this section.
9.4.3 Different stages of generalisation

Detailed analysis of Soseki’s 3PP use demonstrates the processes of both ‘generalisation’ – the initially specific and limited use of the kare type pronoun broadening their referent range and contexts to include any characters in the story, and ‘specialization’ – various forms and annotations of kare and kanojo being consolidated to one, 彼 for kare and 彼女 for kanojo. As investigated in Chapters 7 and 8, in Soseki’s writing the kare type is fully generalized by Higansugimade (Until the Equinox, 1911), meaning that almost all characters are referred to as kare, kanojo, or karera indiscriminately, as distinct from the specific use of these in his earlier novels. In other words, the kare type in his later novels are more neutral than those in his earlier novels because of the generalization.

By comparison, kare pronouns in Shiga’s works show a difference stage. In his novels, kare or kanojo always refers to a specific person. For instance, Aru ichipēji (A Page, 1909) has 193 tokens of kare, all of which refer to the main protagonist whose name is not disclosed. Similarly, Kare to mutsu toshiue no onna (He and Six-year-older Woman, 1910) and Nijūdai ichimen (An Aspect of His Twentieth, 1912) have 41 and 60 tokens of kare respectively, and without exception they refer to the main protagonists, who are never named. This specific reference of kare is repeated in every third person narrative story of Shiga’s that has been investigated in this Chapter. This means that Shiga’s kare is not generalized at all and used more like a proper noun.

The other distinct feature of Shiga’s use of the kare type is that they overwhelmingly appear in third person narrative. Table 9-4 shows the tokens of the kare type in the writing of Shiga, Soseki and Tanizaki according to narrative types.

In Shiga’s writing nearly 85% of the kare type appears in third person narrative and 13 out of 21 novels written in first person do not have any tokens of them at all. There seems to be a simple rule for Shiga that the main protagonist of the first person narrative is referred to as ‘I’ and that of the third person narrative as ‘he’, and these two pronouns refer to the same person, the author himself. In other words, for Shiga, the boundary
between the two narrative types is blurred and his third person narrative novels can be transformed to first person narrative novels with a simple change of *kare* (*he*) to *watashi* (*I*), because he is always telling his own story. This kind of specific use of *kare*— thinly disguising the narrator/author—is also observed in the Naturalist writer, Tayama Katai. Yanabu (1995) demonstrates how Katai used *kare* to tell a story of a disgraced soldier without disclosing his name until the very last moment—after his death. Yanabu concludes that Katai’s specific and almost proper noun-like *kare* is used for its novelty’s sake.

Table 9-4 *Kare* 3PPs in 1st person narrative and 3rd person narrative novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shiga Naoya 1908-26</th>
<th>characters</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kanojo</th>
<th>karera</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>/100k characters</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P narrative novels</td>
<td>129,068</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>92.19</td>
<td>15.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P narrative novels</td>
<td>223,840</td>
<td>1088</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>502.59</td>
<td>84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>352,908</td>
<td>1203</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1244</td>
<td>352.49</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natsume Soseki 1905-16</th>
<th>characters</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kanojo</th>
<th>karera</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>/100k characters</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P narrative novels</td>
<td>1,083,612</td>
<td>1099</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>164.26</td>
<td>27.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P narrative novels</td>
<td>1,248,458</td>
<td>3789</td>
<td>1243</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>5311</td>
<td>425.40</td>
<td>72.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,332,070</td>
<td>4888</td>
<td>1691</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>7091</td>
<td>304.06</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanizaki Junichirō 1909-28</th>
<th>characters</th>
<th>kare</th>
<th>kanojo</th>
<th>karera</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>/100k characters</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1P narrative novels</td>
<td>238,400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>252.92</td>
<td>47.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3P narrative novels</td>
<td>202,500</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>276.04</td>
<td>52.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>440,900</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1161</td>
<td>263.32</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Soseki’s case, various characters other than third person narrator in his novels are referred to as *kare*, while the narrator, especially in his later novels, is invisible. Unlike Shiga, whose third person narrator tells the author’s story under the thin disguise of ‘he’, his narrators do not confess. Even in the most autobiographical novel, *Michikusa*, 18 characters are referred to as *kare* and these characters, including the main protagonist, maintain a certain distance from the narrator. *Michikusa*’s *kare* is both general and neutral and not interchangeable with ‘I’. This use of *kare* pronouns sets Soseki apart from the Naturalist writers such as Katai and the individualistic *Shirakaba* group writers such as Shiga.
The frequencies in Tanizaki’s novels show a pattern that is somewhat different from Soseki’s and Shiga’s. The total frequency of the *kare* type is lower than that of Soseki’s at 263 per 100,000 characters, but the frequency in first person narrative is almost as high as that in third person. What this means is that in his first person narrative novels, the narrator does not necessarily talk about his/her own stories but more often someone else’s. Apart from a couple of autobiographical novels, Tanizaki’s novels do not take the form of confessional style that is favoured by many Naturalist and *Shirakaba* group writers. His use of the *kare* type is not as specific as Shiga’s. It is more general and broader. For example, in *Itansha no kanashimi* (*The Sorrow of a Heretic*, 1917) *kare* is used not only for the main protagonist, Shōtarō, but also for his uncle, his father and his friends, indicating the generalized use. This generalised use of *kare* and its higher frequency in first person narrative indicate the expanding range of contexts and distribution typical to the stage of ‘generalization’ in the process of grammaticalization.

However, the difference between Soseki’s and Tanizaki’s style is that when there is more than one referent in a scene, Tanizaki uses the *kare* type for one person (usually for a more prominent character) and a proper noun or relational terms for the others. For instance, when a father and a son are on the scene, the son may be referred to as ‘*kare*’ and the father as ‘father’, but Soseki would use *kare* for both of them. In this sense, Soseki’s *kare* is more generalised than Tanzaki’s in terms of referents (while Tanizaki’s *kare* may be more generalised in terms of cross-narrative use) and it makes the frequency of the *kare* type in Soseki’s later novels much higher than those in Shiga’s and Tanizaki’s in the scope of the same period.

### 9.5 Role of translation

Unlike their predecessors, the path was already laid for Shiga and Tanizaki when they started writing. They did not have to go over the hurdles of being torn between languages (Chinese or Western), and styles (formal or colloquial). Furthermore, the
choice of a narrative type, while still a little problematic, was not entirely new. They belonged to the generation of writers who neither had the foundation of traditional Chinese and formal Japanese writing nor extensive Western language education (Noguchi 1980: 146). In other words, their only means was the modern colloquial writing style and their sources of inspiration were the Naturalist novels and translations. The late 1900s to early 1910s, when they were starting to write, were the peak of the naturalists such as Tayama Katai, Kunikida Doppo and Shimazaki Tōson, who had been inspired by Futabatei Shimei’s translations of Turgenev’s short stories in the 1880s (Yanagida 1966: 141). Tōson (1909: 90) describes how influential these translations were to them:

When Aibiki (Tryst) and Meguriai (An Encounter) appeared in Kokumin no Tomo (Friends of the Nation) I was still a student. Futabatei gave me a strong and long-lasting impression. It was not just me; all my friends were taken by his translations. My friend, Yanagita Kunio, and I often spent evenings wondering among a copse of trees and reciting passages from his translations. (...) Kunikida notes in his Musashino that he, too, used to enjoy read them aloud.

Shimazaki Tōson, Hasegawa Futabatei o itamu, 1909.

This is an example of translations of Western literature playing an important role when writers and readers alike were feeling the inadequacy of the traditional means of writing to express their modern sensibility, but at the same time did not know how to achieve it. Yoshida (1980: 26) views that “translated literature was more meaningful as a guiding model of Western literature that contributed to the materialization of a new form of Japanese literature, rather than for its own literary value”. In this way, the following generations of writers such as Shiga and Tanizaki were still under the influence of translation, as Tanizaki (1929: 172) himself confessed:

When we were just starting as writers, our colloquial writing reached the extreme Westernisation that coincided with the emergence of the Naturalism. (...) Although our colloquial writing is classified as creative writing, it is merely an extension of translation.

Gendai kōgobun no ketten (The weakness of the modern colloquial writing), 1929.

In another essay, Bunshō dokuhon (Manual of Style), Tanazaki (1934) openly admits that, like many other young writers of his time, the ideal Japanese writing to him in his youth was a Westernised writing (p. 53) and he always tried his best to write in a manner that he thought would be easier to translate into English (p. 174). However, when
Tanizaki talks about writing closer to English, he is not necessarily talking about original English writing. Since his English education was limited and his English proficiency not so high (Inoue 2004), it is more likely that his source of reference is translations of Western novels. In other words, the particular style created in the process of translation (translationese) by translators such as Fujita Mokichi and Morita Shiken who did not hesitate to bend Japanese grammar in order to be true to the original texts (Katō 1991), and by Futabatei Shimei who introduced the modern sensibility and atmospheric landscape of Russian literature into Japanese. This is why Tanizaki brings the Westernised writing and the Naturalist writers together in his essay. He describes modern Japanese writing as something like a translation from Western languages or a hybrid of Japanese and Western languages (1934: 136). As Komori (1988a: 53) sums it up, ‘homogeneous translation style’ became the basis of the literary writing of this period and to some degree continues to this day.

In this period of naturalists’ dominance, their obsession with self, and a ‘homogeneous translation style’ or ‘institutionalised writing’ as Karatani called it, Soseki stayed away from the mainstream literary circle and kept producing novels that are rich in both variety of styles and structure. Karatani (1993: 12) argues that Soseki’s view of literature “was seen, not as an anachronism, but as an eccentricity”. This is because Soseki was fundamentally a theoretician and maintained “a certain distance between himself and literature” (p. 17) and “detachment towards human affairs (including those of the self)” (p. 181). By contrast, Naturalists and confessional writers were uniformly against structure, logic and intellectuality (p. 172) and were increasingly interested in describing their own lives rather than creating a “self sufficient fictional world” (p. 76), which is exactly what the majority of readers were longing for after a long spell of boring descriptions of uneventful lives of confessional writers. This is well illustrated by Soseki’s move to the Asahi newspaper and the popularity of his serialised novels in the Asahi.
9.6 Serialized nature of Soseki’s novels

One aspect of Soseki’s writing that sets him apart from his contemporaries is its serialised nature and his commitment to this method of publication. First, his novels were published at irregular intervals in monthly journals such as *Hototogisu (Bush Warbler)* and *Teikoku bungaku (Imperial Literature)*, whose targets were predominantly educated male readers, while he doubled as a university lecturer. Then as a full-time writer, he began to be published in a daily instalment in the *Asahi* newspaper. The move to *Asahi* required commitment in two ways: to entertain the large anonymous readership and to maintain literary quality, both of which he achieved with relative ease. Tanizaki (1933: 98-100) who also wrote serialized novels but much later than Soseki’s time, cunningly points out the insight of the *Asahi* management who recruited Soseki as having a keen eye for what readers really want to read as distinct from what the mainstream literary fashion is. Tanizaki argues that some writers, such as Soseki, Kafū and Tokutomi Roka, who did not belong to the main literary circle dominated by Naturalists, were able to keep writing because of their immense popularity among the general readers. The first novel Soseki wrote for the *Asahi*, *Gubijinso (A Poppy)*, 1907, was criticised by fellow writers as being too decorative and laboured, but was obviously well received by the majority of the *Asahi* readers for its storyline and rich expressions.

The benefit of Soseki’s move was mutual. For the *Asahi*, which had started as a tabloid for the merchant class and dramatically increased its circulation on account of Russo-Japanese War (1904), Soseki’s recruitment helped to establish it as one of the intellectual newspapers (Komori 1988a: 55-6). He also contributed to its expanding circulation, said to be over 200,000 in 1907 (the year of Soseki’s move). In turn, the large circulation of the paper helped Soseki to acquire a wider readership – the circulation reached 350,000 in 1914 seven years after his move (Ariyama 1996: 88). Komori points out that the choice of third person narrative in *Gubijinso* was related to the change in the medium of publication (from specialised intellectual journals to a major national newspaper) as well as the readership (from intellectuals to a wider general public). This is also the point I made in my analysis of the two versions of
London shōsoku in Chapter 4. Soseki’s subsequent career and his variety of writing were direct reflections of his newspaper readership and up-to-date linguistic reality of the time (eg. Soseki’s young female characters speak in a manner that was fashionable among the middle class girls in Tokyo at the time). He also made effective uses of news items such as Nittō scandal (a bribery scandal of a sugar manufacturer, Nittō) and the Baien scandal (a novel based on a double suicide attempt by a writer, Morita Sōhei and his feminist lover) in his instalments – usually within a week of their appearance in the Asahi newspaper in order to maintain readers’ interest in the story. In other words, the newspaper and Soseki’s novels reinforced each other and cultivated readers’ appetite.

Ōgai and Kafū who wrote mainly for intellectual literary journals, naturally took a different path from Soseki’s. In a sense, they were less experimental and less in touch with the general public and current linguistic trends (at least in a colloquial sense). The frequency patterns on Chart 9-C represent the different paths they followed.

9.7 Conclusion

The investigation of the kare type 3PPs in five writers’ novels in the Meiji-Taishō periods revealed some contrasting features. Ōgai, Soseki and Kafū who spent some time in Western counties, start with relatively high frequencies of the kare type pronouns in their first novels and essays based in Western countries. On their return to Japan the frequencies drop and for Ōgai and Kafū, they never rise again throughout their writing careers, but Soseki’s frequencies increase dramatically after a few low rates in his early first person narrative novels. The further analysis of the kare type pronoun in these novels suggests that the two opposite paths taken by Ōgai/Kafū and Soseki are the results of the difference in narrative types (first person vs. third person) and genres (historical/nostalgic novels vs. modern colloquial novels). The third group (Shiga and Tanizaki) show a relatively stable middle frequency curves, indicating the integrated and advanced stage of grammaticalization of the kare type in their writing, although the degrees of generalisation in these two writers differ somewhat. In Tanizaki’s novels, the
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*kare* type pronouns are used for many different characters, while in Shiga’s novels they have specific reference. In other words, Tanizaki’s use is more general than Shiga’s. However, in comparison to Soseki’s use, Tanizaki’s is less general. For example, when there are a number of characters in one scene, Tanizaki tends to use the *kare* type 3PP for the main character, and proper names, common names or relationship names for the others, while Soseki tends, at least in his later novels, to use the *kare* type for multiple characters. In this sense, Soseki’s use is more general than Tanizaki’s.

The three groups of writers represent the three stages of the S-curve of the *kare* type use: Ōgai and Kafū representing gradual beginning and resistance, Soseki, rapid spread and generalization, and Shiga and Tanizaki, gradual tapering off and assimilation. At the same time, Soseki’s curve alone could stand for the whole process of the S-curve in the mere 16 years of his writing career. This makes him something very special in the history of modern Japanese literature. Starting from the traditional *kanbun* background, the agonizing encounter with English language and literature, and the attempt to bridge the two, in which he succeeded to a large degree. His writing does not contain overt Western influences as are often seen in other writers works such as Katai, Bimyō, or even in the more conservative Ōgai, who would insert Western terms in their original alphabetic forms (English, French or German) into his texts. In Soseki’s case, Western elements are thoroughly worked out before they are transplanted into his writing. Therefore superficially his style does not appear to be heavily Westernised. However, in a sense the influence is more profound and affects something as fundamental as his narrative style while, for others, it did not extend to more than the word level or at most the rhetorical level. The fact that Soseki is still popular in Japan and most of his works have been translated into other languages also suggests that his writing is compatible with the present writing and structurally easier to translate, well illustrated in the compressed S-curve in Chart 9-C.

Hopper and Traugott (2003:130) suggested that S-curves result from multiple correlated factors rather than from individual localised changes. However, my diachronic investigation of five Japanese writers indicates that, in this case, it is both multiple and
individual, and general and localized. Many varying stages existed in different individuals, at the same time progressing as a larger and collective movement shared by several generations of writers. Some writers show a strong resistance, some show willingness and adaptability, and others just go with the tide. The mechanism of the change is more complex and fractal than one might envisage in the absence of detailed investigation, both quantitative and qualitative.

And what makes Soseki unique are his constant experiments and innovations in search of the right style that could best represent the people and society of his time. In this sense, the serialised nature of his novels in a major daily newspaper played a fundamental role in the progression of his writing, and in return, his writing must have had a strong impact on the newspaper readers and aspiring writers who read his novels, of whom Tanizaki was one.
Conclusion

It is a long-held belief amongst most scholars of Japanese that the *kare* 3PPs (*kare*, *kanojo* and *karera*) are neologisms created simply through contact with Western languages via translation (e.g. Yanase 2000, Yanabu 1996, Mikami 1955 and Shinmura 1945). Three common points lie behind the belief. First, they do not fit into the well-structured Japanese 3PP system, which is organised according to distance from the speaker/writer. These fields are classified as the *ko-so-a* paradigm represented by the first syllable of each category (Sakuma 1937). For instance, *kore*, *sore* and *are*, each refers to an object in the area of near, middle and far distance from the speaker in that order. Second, the *kare* 3PPs differ in that they are relatively free from the honorific values which feature as an important aspect of other Japanese personal pronouns. Third, their frequency increase coincided with the period of contact with Western languages, especially English. All these points suggest that the origin of the *kare* 3PPs is rooted in translation from Western languages. For this reason, they were excluded from grammar books until quite recently (at least the 1970s).

On the other hand, Li (2002) showed the pivotal role that Chinese played in the adoption of *kare* into Japanese in his study of the pre-20th century shift of Japanese demonstratives to 3PPs. He also points out *kare*’s tendency to appear in formal writing, as distinct from that of the *ko-so-a* set in colloquial writing. Li’s two discoveries are, in fact, natural outcomes of a social practice where Chinese style is a High variety of writing in a diglossic nation. Okumura (1957), nearly half a century before Li, recognised the tendency of *kare* to appear mostly in the narrative rather than the dialogue parts of novels written between the late 19th and mid 20th centuries. Separately in time, these two scholars extracted key features of the *kare* 3PPs, which indicate their specific uses in formal style and narrative genre. However, both failed to explain the connection between the pre-modern *kare* and the modern equivalent. In other words, how the *kare* that was frequent in Chinese-influenced formal writing came to be used in the narrative part of modern colloquial novels remained a mystery.
Noguchi, in his investigation of literary change during the 18th to 19th centuries, focused on the adoption of the new concept, ‘the third person’. He argued that pre-modern Japanese literature did not embrace the concept of the third person for reasons of a strong oral tradition, immediacy of the story, and a present tense that reports events as if they are happening before the very eyes of the reader. Much as Roland Barthes stressed the past tense, third person and 3PP as three pillars of the Modern Novel, Noguchi highlighted a strong connection between the shift from the present to past tense in novel writing and the emergence of the third person concept, and between the past tense and the use of the 3PPs. However, like Li’s study, Noguchi’s investigation did not go beyond the 19th century and failed to capture the adoptive process of the concept and 3PPs.

Thus Part One of this thesis investigated various approaches related to the emergence of the kare 3PPs and reflects on the lack of empirical studies of their uses in a crucial time of change.

Chapter 1 recognised the importance of language reform at the end of the 19th century, the subsequent rise of the modern notion of literature, and the influence of both internal and external factors on the development of the kare 3PPs. It also gave a clear definition of Japanese personal pronouns in relation to their English counterparts.

Chapter 2 introduced the areas of grammaticalization, language contact and translation studies, with comprehensive summaries of the theories relevant to each area. It proposed a combined approach – the notion of contact-induced grammaticalization – that would help untangle the complex and multi-layered process of 3PP change. As a powerful tool of investigation, the methods of corpus linguistics were explained, with a list of electronic resources and concordance software that made possible the statistical compilation of data from a large volume of written texts. These methods make this study far more thorough and reliable than previous studies, which had been reliant on small-scale investigations and informed speculation. Chapter 3 reviewed research on personal pronouns from several related areas of study. It found that most research on personal
pronouns had focused on the 1PP and 2PP. This is largely because of the honorific nature of personal pronouns in Japanese that attracts scholars to synchronic, social, and psychological rather than diachronic investigation, which tries to recognise some mechanisms independent of, or at least relatively free from, the constraint of honorific relationships. Likewise, in European languages, the focus has also been on the discourse situation and the 1PP and 2PP, since the groundbreaking politeness theory of Brown and Gilman (1960).

This study aimed to fill two significant gaps in personal pronoun research on Japanese: time (the early modern period) and type (3PP).

Part Two makes specific observations of Meiji and Taisho writers, with Natsume Soseki as the main representative of the period. This gives confirmation to the general ‘theory of grammaticalization’, allows for clearer and deeper insights to be made about the process of pronoun change, as discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, and sheds further light on current conflicting opinions about the origin of the Kare pronouns.

The first chapter of Part Two – Chapter 4 – shows what changes can be observed between 1901 and 1915 in Soseki’s two versions of the same essay, London shōsoku (Letters from London). It displays all the dichotomies raised in Part One: formal writing vs. colloquial writing, dialogue vs. narrative and present tense vs. past tense. It is even able to show different types of PPs and sentence endings in each version as well as the increased frequency and specialisation of 3PP reference in the 1915 version (LON2). The two versions of London shōsoku demonstrate clearly the shift from formal to colloquial, indirect speech to direct speech in dialogue and present tense to past tense in narrative. And further investigation of sentence ending types and 3PP frequency shows a drastic reduction in varieties, in particular, consolidation to one type, the ta ending and much increased 3PP frequency in LON2. These observations give further support to Noguchi’s hypothesis that the shift to a uniform past tense in narrative motivated the increased use of 3PPs. In addition to this, LON 2 displays a new female 3PP, kanojo, which was absent in the first version. Comparison with Soseki’s fellow writers
demonstrates that around 1900, kanojo was not used in novels but appeared to have been common in the 1910s. This supports the claim that Soseki’s 3PP use was not unique but a reflection of the general trend of the time. Chapter 4 extracts several key changes between the beginning and the end of Soseki’s writing career but does not explain how or why the changes occurred. These questions are addressed in the chapters that follow.

Chapter 5, covering the most productive decade of Soseki’s career, shows how his use of PPs, especially 3PPs, changed. The kare 3PPs that were scarce in the first six of his 13 novels gradually increased their frequency to reach a phenomenal rate of appearance in his last two novels. Their increasing use is observed in connection with the acquired use of the third person narrative, which also hardly featured in his earlier novels. However, just before the kare 3PPs became commonly used, increased frequencies of personal names (that are traditional terms of reference) had occurred. In addition, the common nouns otoko and onna were also used pronominally in the novels written in the middle part of his career: in effect, these acted as substitutes for 3PPs, bridging the shift from proper names to kare 3PPs. This coexistence of a variety of forms in the terms of reference is the result of ongoing diachronic shift and is symptomatic of a transitional process. And the major influencing factor in the 3PP change is cross-cultural contact, which in Soseki’s case is with English and, in particular, contact with modern Western third person narrative writing.

Chapter 6 however, in covering the period before Soseki and focusing on the two 3PPs – kare and are, reveals a much more complicated picture. In Edo fiction, two distinctive patterns of use represented by two distinctive genres of fiction surfaced. That is, the strong association of are with colloquial novels and dialogue, and of kare with formal Chinese influenced novels and narrative. Many Meiji writers also display tendencies similar to Edo writers; for example, Ogai’s formal style novels with higher frequencies of kare and the colloquial novels by Shōyō and Shimei, with are. However, Soseki’s novels alone show a hybrid pattern of kare/are use. Kare, which had been used more frequently in Edo and early Meiji formal fiction, was adopted in Soseki’s colloquial novels at a higher frequency. While this is credited to his particular education in both
Chinese style writing and English language, a number of external factors are also involved: these include the common use of source text-oriented translation in foreign language primers and literary translation, government promotion of modern colloquial writing, and the arrival of a new generation of readers who were accustomed to a new style of writing with appearances of *kare* through their education and reading. In other words, readers were ready too for the use of *kare* in colloquial novels and the time was right for Soseki.

There is no denying that contact with the West played a significant role in the adoptive process of *kare*. However, the long tradition of contact with Chinese and translated Chinese stories had laid the foundation for the change. *Kare* in the Chinese-influenced formal High variety Japanese writing over many centuries was the key factor in the shift to its inclusion in colloquial writing that became the preferred style of the 20th century.

Chapter 7 focuses on the referents of *kare* 3PPs. The investigation of *kare* referents from the late Edo to Meiji periods demonstrates a specializing process, from more general multi-purpose reference, to human, to singular human, and finally to male singular human reference. The further investigation of Soseki’s novels shows, within the specialized area of male singular human reference, the expanding use of the *kare* type from more limited and specific reference to wide-ranging characters in the stories. Also, there occurred the simultaneous expansion of collocations with a greater variety of particles. Together, these contributed to the frequency increase of the *kare* 3PPs at the expense of the pronominal use of proper names.

The investigation of the female equivalent, *kanojo*, in Chapter 8 demonstrates the formative process of a new 3PP. Although, 彼女 (*kanojo*) was the preferred form and annotation, various annotations of 彼女, as well as various forms of *kanojo*, co-existed at that time both in Soseki’s and other writers’ novels, indicating a transitional process. It follows the consolidating process of various forms to one preferred form, 彼女, and shortening of the sound from *kanoonna* to *kanojo*. In addition, the broadening referent range of *kanojo* from the main heroine only to any female character is observed in
Soseki’s novels. Similar to the specialization of *kare, kanojo* progressed from the 3PP for non-specific reference (human & non-human) to more specific female singular human reference, and within this specialized area, from exclusive reference for heroines to wider ranging and indiscriminate reference.

These two chapters, showing the almost identical processes of change in *kare* and *kanojo*, indicate clearly the existence of a pattern of change that displays many aspects of grammaticalization identified by Hopper & Traugott (2003) and Brinton & Traugott (2005).

Chapter 9 expands the investigative area and included four more Meiji-Taishō writers, Ogai, Kafū, Shiga and Tanizaki, to compare with Soseki. These are divided into three groups according to their career span: a) Ogai and Kafū, b) Soseki, and c) Shiga and Tanizaki. The three groups of writers represent the three stages of *kare* type use on the S-curve of change: Ogai and Kafū represent a gradual beginning and resistance, Soseki the rapid spread and generalization, and Shiga and Tanizaki a gradual tapering off and assimilation. At the same time, Soseki’s curve alone can be seen to stand for the whole process in the mere 16 years of his writing career.

Here, again the interaction of individual and wider change is observed. This could answer the question posed by Hopper and Traugott (2003: 130), who ask to “what extent S-curves are the product of multiple correlated factors contributing to morphosyntactic change or individual localized changes?” The answer in this case is both multiple and individual, and general and localized. As explained in Chapter 9, several and varying stages exist in different individuals, while at the same time, progressing as a larger collective movement shared by a generation of writers. The mechanism of the change is more complex and multi-layered than one might envisage.

Another important factor to note is that the progression of Soseki’s 3PP use and that of his colloquial writing go hand in hand with the serialised nature of his novels in a major daily newspaper. Here, the area of co-influence between writer and readers, and the
immediacy of his writing to the language practised by his readers are important. This is one of the main reasons why his novels are both still readable and widely read a century later.

An intention of this thesis was to clarify the formative and changing process of kare 3PP use by way of historical investigation in response to conflicting current opinion about them. Contrary to the common notion of kare 3PPs as simply products of influence from the translation of Western languages, it illustrates a far more complex picture. The role of Chinese and Chinese style writing as the H variety in a long diglossic history of Japanese must also be taken into account. The case study of Soseki highlights him as a writer who managed to combine both tradition and modernity, Chinese and English, and formal and colloquial aspects in his writing. It also demonstrates change as the interaction of multiple factors, individual and collective, localised and widespread, temporarily overlapping and gradually prompting shifts from one form to another.

Another intention and natural outcome of the thesis was to present a model for diachronic investigations with empirical data. As stated earlier in the thesis, pronoun change is viewed as part of a larger writing reform that was taking place in the 1900s and a microcosm of a larger change. Therefore, the methods used here can be applied to investigations of other aspect of the change.

The first step of the case study was to identify exactly what changed in the period under investigation. Then, in the chapters that followed each change was closely examined to find out how it changed, with quantitative methods using appropriate corpora. In fact, this study has recorded a step-by-step shift of the kare 3PPs from their near absence in the early modern colloquial novels to a ubiquitous presence in Soseki’s later novels and the work of writers after Soseki. The intricate processes and clearer view of the change were captured and presented visually with tables, graphs and diagrams. At the same time, qualitative methods derived from historical linguistics and translation studies, were also applied to identify possible causes of the change (why) and to extract characteristics of change with constant reference to the aspects of grammaticalization identified by
Hopper, Traugott, Brinton and others. Overall, the pattern of the 3PP change around the turn of the 20th century conforms to the strong tendencies of grammaticalization, thus revealing a universal dimension to the change in the Japanese 3PP shift.

In terms of contributing factors, the work identifies several. Individually, the particular language background of a writer and overseas experience were important influences on 3PP use. Collectively, factors such as the pre-existence of kare in the H variety of language, uniform use of the ta ending in narrative, the practice of word-for-word translation in schools and the government orchestrated promotion of colloquial speech and writing, affected a new generation of readers and writers. Change occurred when these multiple — individual and collective, linguistic and extra-linguistic — factors met at the right time in the right place to reinforce each other. The result may appear to be a sudden shift as demonstrated by the dramatic frequency increase of kanojo between Mon (1910) and Higansugimade (1911) from a mere 10 tokens to 243 tokens per 100,000 characters, shown in Chapter 8. However, this change was preceded by increased third person reference with proper names and the pronominal use of common nouns in his previous novels; and the appearance of kanojo in other writers’ novels at about the same time.

Thus, in explaining the theories of language change (grammaticalization, language contact and interference), in demonstrating how these have shaped the development of the kare 3PPs in literary writing and in presenting an empirical model for historical investigations, this work has fulfilled its intent: it has provided a very ‘significant step’ in the clarification of the mechanism of 3PP change which is a source of confusion for writers, translators and other language professionals who use Japanese.

The same methods could be applied successfully to the investigation of recent language changes that are demonstrated in Appendix A.
Appendix A

Stories of *kare* after Soseki – female plural 3PP

1 Introduction

The *kare* 3PPs have continued to evolve in two different directions after Soseki. One is further expansion as 3PPs. The other is *divergence* (Hopper 1991) to common nouns and then to proper nouns. These are represented by the following stages:

a) the appearance of the female plural form *kanojotachi/kanojora* (*they*)
b) the use of *kare* and *kanojo* for close friends and family members in certain, limited circumstances
c) the nominal use of *kare* and *kanojo* as boyfriend and girlfriend
d) *kanojo* as a proper noun
e) the reappearance of *kano*

Stages a) and b) are further developments as 3PPs and stages c), d) and e) are divergence to nominal functions. The former can be seen as stages of *grammaticalization* (a shift of linguistic item to a more grammatical one), and the latter appear to present themselves as examples of *lexicalisation* (the development of a fully referential lexical item from a less lexical, non-lexical, or grammatical item (Hopper & Traugott 1993: 49)). In this case, a shift from personal pronoun to common noun, then to proper noun.

This chapter will follow the first change (stage a) above) of the *kare* 3PP after Soseki. It will illustrate the advanced stage of *kare* 3PPs with the addition of the female plural 3PPs and subsequent expansion of their referent territory. The creation of female plural 3PPs cannot be explained as interference from foreign languages. Neither of the contact
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1 Appendix A was written as a journal article, and contains a summary of some background information that also appears much earlier in the main body of the thesis. However, to ensure the reader has access to this important background material in the context of the Appendix, it is summarised again here. As a whole, Appendix A is substantially new material and included here as reinforcement of the thesis.
languages, Chinese and English, differentiates gender in plural 3PPs. It is the result of domestication (internalisation) and change in social dynamics (e.g. the status of women in the society) that motivated the creation.

First, Section 2 gives a brief history of Japanese 3PPs and a review of existing studies. Section 3 investigates literary texts and determines the time of appearance of female plural 3PPs in novels. Section 4 captures the invasion of the third person reference from outside territory to the inner circle. In these two sections (3 and 4), my investigation on 3PPs in novels by Soseki, is referred to for historical comparison. Finally, section 5 concludes with a summary of the present situation of the kare pronouns in Japan.

2 Brief history of kare

Since the history of kare has been extensively explained in the main thesis, only a very short summary is given here.

2.1 From the beginning to Soseki's time

Many scholars such as Sakuma (1936), Hirota (1953) and Okumura (1954), and translators such as Yanase (2000), classified the kare 3PPs, kare (he), kanojo (she) and karera (they), as a new type of 3PPs created through contact with the West during the Meiji period. They thought the influence from Western languages, especially in translation, as the key factor in the increased use of the kare 3PPs. This view has been widely accepted.

However, studies by Hida (2002), Yanabu’s (1996) and Sōgō (1988) found some of the earlier uses of kare as the 3PP in Dutch-Japanese translation in the late 18th to early 19th century. They suggest that the kare 3PPs were products of Dutch-Japanese translation in the late Edo period and gradually developed throughout the Meiji period among intellectuals. Although their appearance in Meiji novels was something of a novelty,
they quickly gained a special position in Japanese language through repeated use and became preferred terms for third person reference.

On the other hand, Li’s recent investigation compares the historical changes in Japanese demonstratives that include personal pronouns with those in Chinese and finds a strong link between them. He demonstrates that, throughout history, *kare* (*he*) has had a degree of interaction with Chinese, starting from the annotation of the character 彼 in Old Chinese Buddhist texts in the eighth century to translation of Chinese vernacular novels in the late Edo and early Meiji periods.

These findings indicate the strong connection between the contact with foreign languages and the *kare* 3PPs. It is likely that *kare* has present been in Japanese ever since the Japan’s adoption of Chinese writing (sometime in the fifth century) with some regularity, and the contact with Western languages (in the late 19th to early 20th centuries) accelerated its frequency and the creation of a female form, *kanojo*.

### 2.2 Kare 3PPs in Soseki’s time

My own investigation of Soseki’s works from 1901 to 1916 illustrates the detailed change in his use of the *kare* 3PPs. *Kare* (*he*), scarce in his early novels, gradually increased in frequency and reached its peak in his second last novel. Its female equivalent, *kanojo* (*she*), was introduced slightly later in his writing but followed a similar pattern of increase, and became almost as frequent as *kare* by the end of his career. These increases are partly due to his skilful adoption of third person narrative into his modern Japanese novels. Soseki was the first Japanese novelist to develop a more neutral and general, as distinct from a specific and marked, use of *kare* and *kanojo*: they are used for almost any character in his novels. However, Soseki was not a typical writer of his time. Many of his contemporaries such as Mori Ogai and Tayama Katai maintained a very specific use of *kare* (*kare* was almost exclusively used for the main protagonists of their novels) and even much younger writers such as Shiga and
Akutagawa continued to use *kare* and *kanojo* only for particular protagonists in their novels (see Chapter 9). These persistent uses of specific 3PPs in novels are not uncommon even today, and neutral and general use of *kare* and *kanojo* are often treated as something foreign to the Japanese language (e.g. Yanabu 1995, Yanase 2000).

My study also captures a clear S-curve in the frequency change of the *kare* 3PPs in Soseki’s writing. It shows rare and specific appearances of *kare* and *kanojo* in his earlier novels, much increased frequency and more general use halfway through his career, tapering off in his final novel.

The historical change of *kare* is shown diagramatically in Figure A-A, starting from the all-purpose, genderless, numberless *kare* (far left).

**Figure A-A Diachronic change of *kare* 3PP**

Changes occurred: □ before the Meiji period, □ during Soseki’s lifetime and □ after Soseki.

The first branch indicates the separation of the plural, *karera*, then female singular, *kanojo*, and finally the female plural, *kanojora* or *kanojotachi*. Both -*ra* and -*tachi* are suffixes that indicate the plural. It also shows that after each separation of a new form, *kare* itself has become more and more specialized and is finally left with only one function – that of ‘male singular human’ reference. As *kare* has become generalized in
meaning and use, it has pushed other terms of male singular third person reference out of use and has become the preferred choice for the 3PP. This process is called specialization (Hopper and Traugott 2003). The right hand side is the present situation. As my earlier study suggests, the female singular, kanojo, started to appear with some regularity around 1900 and was commonly used in novels by 1910. However, no female plural 3PP is found in Soseki’s writing, which indicates that the plural female 3PP may have appeared after Soseki’s death in 1916. None of the above scholars mention when it first appeared in Japanese literature.

The branching out of female plural 3PP is the focus of the following section.

3 Kanojotachi/kanojora (female they)

3.1 Birth of kanojotachi/kanojora

As Figure A-A above illustrates, the branching out and specializing process of kare into various forms and functions as occurred in different periods. The plural form karera was the first to emerge from kare, which occurred around the 13th century (Li 2002: 222) and since then has coexisted with kare. Kanojo was the next to emerge in the 19th century. Compared to these, kanojotachi and kanojora are very young terms and the time of their emergence has not been investigated. When did the female plural 3PP start to appear?

In the late Meiji to early Taishō periods (early 20th century), when Soseki was writing, the plural 3PP, karera, and female singular, kanojo, were commonly used but the female plural forms kanojotachi and kanojora were very rare in writing. Soseki himself never used them in his novels. Instead, he used karera (male/generic plural) or kanojo (female singular) for female plural 3PPs, as shown below.

1. 彼等は固より不正な人間ではない。(London shōsoku, 1901: 21)
   Karera wa motoyori fusei naningen dewa nai.
   (They [sisters] are, by no means, evil people.)

2. 彼女姉妹の家財は早晩其借越の家賃の代りに奪われるのが...(London shōsoku, 1915:49)
   Kanojo shimai no zaisan wa sóban sono karikoshi no yachinn no kawari ni ubawareru...
(Soon or later, their [they – the sisters - + possessive particle] belongings will be taken away for
the unpaid rent…)

The “sisters” in both examples refer to Soseki’s landlady and her younger sister. Example 1 is from Soseki’s first essay *London Shōsoku* (*Letters from London*, 1901) written in a colloquial style and *karera* is used to refer to the sisters. In this whole essay there is no appearance of the female singular 3PP, *kanojo*. Instead he uses *kare* and *karera* for both sexes. Example 2 is an example from the same essay revised in 1915 and shows the use of *kanojo* (female singular 3PP) for a female plural. It demonstrates the existence of *kanojo* and absence of *kanojotachi* or *kanojora* in 1915. It also suggests that *kanojo* was not yet specialized as the female singular 3PP. Soseki’s novels were serialized in a daily instalment in the *Asahi* newspaper. His notes and letters to friends reveal that he was sensitive to the modern colloquial Tokyo dialect. The absence of *kanojotachi* or *kanojora* in his writing indicates that these forms either did not exist or were hardly used during his lifetime.

The earliest examples of female plural 3PPs that I have found are in Nagai Kafū’s *Amerika monogatari* (*Amerika* hereafter 1908), this work has two tokens of *kanojora* written as 彼女等. These are rare examples and often used alongside *karera, onnatacchi* and *onnadomo* (women) for female plural third person reference, as Examples 3, 4 and 5 show. *Kanojora* in *Amerika* may have been the earliest example of its sort, but certainly not a common one and its use is limited to ‘American women’ (see Example 3), even though there are several Japanese female characters in the novel. In the same novel, *karera* is used more frequently rather than *kanojora* to refer to women as in Example 4. The *karera* in Example 4 also refers to Western women.

His later novel based in Japan, *Bokutō kitan* (1937), has six tokens of 彼女達 but these are annotated as *kano-onna-tachi* rather than *kano-jo-tachi* (Example 5). This could mean that *kanojotachi* or *kanojora* were acceptable for foreign women but not sufficiently familiarized to refer to Japanese women; as *karera* was also often used for foreigners in its early stage of use in the Meiji period. The co-existence of a variety of other forms such as *onnatachi* and *onnadomo*, and the infrequent use of *kanojora* in the
novel as well as the fact that few other novelists were using it, support this analysis. Also all of Kafū’s kanojora and kanoonnatachi refer to a particular generic group:
Western women in Amerika (Examples 3) and prostitutes in Bokutō kitan (Example 5).
In addition, Kafū’s annotations for compound characters, 彼女, in Amerika are extremely varied as shown in Table 8-5 in Chapter 8. These suggest the very early stage of grammaticalization and selective use of the female plural 3PPs.

3. 彼女等は極端な芸術論や激しい人生問題の話相手とするには余り快活で... 
Kanojora wa kyokutana geijutsuron ya hageshii jinseimondai no hanashiaite to suruniwa amarini kaikatsu de amarini shisō ga kenzensugiru... (Amerika monogatari 1908: 300)
(They [f] are too lively for the discussion of pure theories of the Arts or important issues of life.)

4. 彼等の化粧の奇妙なる、流行の選択の機敏なのに、無情の敬意を払っている第一人である。
Karena no keshōhō no kōmyōnaru, ryūkō no sentaku no kibinnano ni, mujō no kei o haratteiru daiichinin dearu. (Amerika monogatari 1908: 337)
(I am the first person to admire their [Western women] excellent makeup technics and sharp eye for fashion.)

5. わたくしは彼女達と懇意になるには少なくてとも彼女達から敬して遠ざけられないためには、現在の身分はかくしている方がよいと思った。
Watakushi wa kanoonnatachi to konni ni naru niwa – sukunakutomo kanoonnatachi kara keishite tozakerarenai tameniwa, genzai no mibun wa kakushite iru hōga yoito omotta. (Bokutō kitan 1937: 55)
(In order to get to know them well – or, at least, not to be distanced from them, I thought it was better to hide my identity.)

3.2 Generalization of Kanojotachi and kanojora

The other novelist who used female plural 3PPs regularly in the Taishō and early Shōwa periods is Kawabata Yasunari. Starting from Sora ni ugoku akari (A Moving Light in the Sky, 1924), both kanojotachi and kanojora appear in several novels. Table A-1 shows his novels written between 1924 and 1940 that have tokens of these.

The tokens are generally very small except Onsen yado (A Hot Spring Inn, 1929) with 46 tokens of kanojora. Judging by the pattern of the use, in his novels, kanojotachi seems to have appeared first and then came the co-existence of kanojotachi and
kanojora for a few years before kanojora became the preferred form, although the figures are too small to be conclusive.

Table A-1 Kanojotachi/kanojora in Kawabata’s novels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>F. pl. 3PPs</th>
<th>Referents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sora ni ugoku akari</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>Actresses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiroi Mangetsu</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izu no odoriko</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>Dancers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunka daigaku sōwa</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shisha no sho</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shitai shōkainin</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onsen yado</td>
<td>1929</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoru no saikoro</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yukiguni</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>kanojotachi 1</td>
<td>kanojora 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the referents, Kawabata has a tendency to use kanojotachi and kanojora for particular referents. In each novel, they are designated to a specific group of women and not used for other groups in the same novel. In this sense, kanojotachi and kanojora are not much generalized as 3PPs in Kawabata’s novels. The only exception is Shitai shōkainin (The Corpse Trader, 1929) in which kanojora is used for three different groups of women, bus conductors, sisters and nurses.

The more substantial use of kanojotachi or kanojora had to wait until Tanizaki Junichiro’s Sasameyuki (The Makioka Sisters 1944 - 48) written during and published after World War II. This work has 34 token of kanojotachi. Examples 6 and 7 are from Sasameyuki. Kanojotachi refers to servants in Example 6 and the four Makioka sisters (the main characters) in Example 7. These indicate that Tanizaki’s use of kanojotachi, unlike Kafū’s, is not limited to one type or class of women.

6. 幸子は今日の見合ひのことを女中達に話した覚えはないが、特に彼女達に知られないように気を付けてゐなかった。越度はあるので、(Sasameyuki 1982 [1944]: 56)
Sachiko wa kyō no omiai no koto o jochūtachi ni hanashita oboe ha nai ga, toku ni kanojotachi ni sirarenaikyou ni ki o tsuketi inakatta ochido wa arunode,
(Although Yukiko was sure that she had never told her servants of today’s arranged date, since it was her fault for letting them find out...)

7. 彼女たちは、あゝ、これでよかった、これで今年も此の花の満開に行き合わせたと思って、何か少しにほっとすると同時に、来年の奉も亦此の花を見られますようにと願ふのである... (Sasameyuki 1982 [1944]: 142)
Kanojotachi wa, aa, korede yokatta, korede kotoshi mo kono hana no manakai ni ikaiwaseto to omotte, nanikanashi ni hottosuru to doji ni, rainen no haru mo mata kono hana o miraremasyô nito negau nodearu...
(They feel somehow relieved to see the full bloom of the blossoms and wish that they could see these blossoms again next spring.)

While different novels contain different sets of characters, my investigation of female plural 3PPs in several Taishô and early Shôwa novels show some patterns of change. Kanojotachi and kanojora, which were used only for foreigners and prostitutes in Kafû’s novels, have extended their referent range to include various types women in Kawabata’s novels, although they are often used for a particular group of women in each novel. By comparison, in Tanizaki’s Sasameyuki, the referents of kanojotachi include many different types of women and are not limited to any particular group. From this evidence, kanojotachi and kanojora seem to be following the generalizing process as the female plural 3PP by expanding their referent range, although the frequency is still limited.

3.3 Difference between plural suffixes, -tachi and -ra
Why there are two terms for the female plural 3PP, while there is one for the male, is not evident from the previous investigation. Unlike Kawabata, Tanizaki does not use kanojora at all. According to Jung (2003: 144), the difference between -tachi and -ra is regional: -ra is more frequently used in Kansai (Osaka-Kyoto) area and -tachi in Kantô (Tokyo) area. Kawabata was from Osaka, while Tanizaki is from Tokyo. Considering these factors, one possible explanation for Kawabata’s shift from kanojotachi to kanojora is that of returning to his linguistic origin. However, Jung’s study is limited to first and second personal pronouns, and therefore further studies are needed to find out if the same regional difference between -tachi and -ra is found in 3PPs.

Using the novels on the Shinchosha’s CD-ROM, Shincho bunko no hyakusatsu (100 Novels Published by Shichô Paperbacks, 1995), whether the regional difference between the Kantô and Kansai regions in the use of kanojotachi and kanojora exist is investigated. Table A-2 shows the novels on the CD-ROM, which have tokens of the female plural
3PPs in a chronological order. The initial E indicates the eastern part of Japan that includes Kantō and W the western part that includes Kansai.

Table A-2 shows a mixed result, in terms of regional differences. Kantō writers, such as Hori and Kita, use kanojotachi but other Kantō writers, such as Ishikawa and Sono, use kanojora in their respective novels. Similarly, Kansai writers, such as Fukunaga and Kurahashi, use kanojotachi, while Murakami uses both types, although kanojotachi is by far the prominent one. These suggest that, unlike Jung’s (2003) investigation of 1PPs and 2PPs, the regional difference in the use of kanojotachi and kanojora is not evident in 3PPs, as far as Table A-2 is concerned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>kanojora</th>
<th>kanojotachi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaze tachinu</td>
<td>Hori Tatsuo</td>
<td>Tokyo (E)</td>
<td>1934</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusa no hana</td>
<td>Fukunaga Takehiko</td>
<td>Fukuoka (W)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nireke no hitobito</td>
<td>Kita Morio</td>
<td>Tokyo (E)</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sei-shōjo</td>
<td>Kurahashi Yumiko</td>
<td>Köchi (W)</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seishun no satetsu</td>
<td>Ishikawa Tatsuzō</td>
<td>Akita (E)</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarō monogatari</td>
<td>Sono Ayako</td>
<td>Tokyo (E)</td>
<td>1978-9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekai no owari*</td>
<td>Murakami Haruki</td>
<td>Kyoto (W)</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sekai no owari to hādoboirudo wandsārando. W: Kansai, E: Kantō.

Rather than the regional difference, both Tables a-1 and A-2 indicate a possible age or time differences in the use of the two female plural 3PPs. Table A-1 shows that between 1924 and 1928, Kawabata used kanojotachi in his five novels with exceptions of two novels featuring both types, but between 1929 and 1940, he only used kanojora. Similarly, Table A-2 shows the exclusive use of kanojotachi by different writers between 1934 and 1965, and that of kanojora between 1968 and 1979. It appears as if these have been periodical shifts between the preferred use of kanojotachi and that of kanojora. However, the sample of novels used here is too small to be conclusive and further studies with a larger corpus with detailed analysis are needed.
4 Conclusion

This chapter has examined a new change that has occurred to *kare* and *kanojo* since Soseki’s death in 1916; the appearance of female plural forms *kanojotachi* or *kanojora*. My investigation of female plural 3PPs in literary texts has shown that, although their first appearances were documented in the early 1900s (e.g. Nagai Kafū’s *Amerika monogatari*, 1908), female plural 3PP were basically post-Soseki creations. Soseki never used them. Köfu’s use of *kanojora* to refer to Western women is an isolated example, and the fact that he never used it again indicates that it was not a widely accepted use. Only a small number of tokens are found in the pre-war novels that have been investigated (e.g. Kawabata’s novels (1924-40) show some regular uses of both terms) and its generalised use had to wait for Tanizaki’s *Sasameyuki* published after WWII. In this novel, Tanizaki uses *kanojotachi* for women of various types and classes, including foreigners, main protagonists and peripheral characters. In other words, *kanojora* or *kanojotachi* is a relatively young term with only about sixty years history since it became commonly used, and even today its frequency is not very high.

The creation of female plural 3PPs marks the completion of the specialization - the separation of four different forms, *kare* (male singular), *kanojo* (female singular), *karera* (male and generic plural) and *kanojora/kanojotachi* (female plural) 3PPs, from the original *kare*, which functioned more or less for all four types in the Edo period.
<CD-ROMs>

Individual titles used in the thesis.

   Shiga Naoya. 1917. Sasaki no baai.
   Shiga Naoya. 1917. Kinosaki nite.
   Shiga Naoya. 1917. Kōjinbutsu no fūfu.
   Shiga Naoya. 1917. Akanishi Kakita.
   Shiga Naoya. 1918. Jūichigatsu mikka gogo nokoto.
   Shiga Naoya. 1919. Kōzo no kamisama.

   (1) *Soseki’s works*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1905</td>
<td>Wagahaiwa nekodearu (I Am a Cat)</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Sorekara (And Then)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Nihyaku tōka (The 210th day)</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Mon (The Gate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Botchan (Young Master)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Higansugimade (Until the Equinox)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Kusamakura (The Pillow Grass)</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Kōjin (A Traveller)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Bunchō (A Java Sparrow)</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Kokoro (The Heart)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Gubijinsō (The Peony)</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Michikusa (Detour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Kōfu (A Miner)</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td>Garasudono uchi (Inside of the Glass Door)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Ejitsu shōhin (A Long Day, Short Essays)</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Meian (Light and Darkness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Sanshirō (Sanshirō)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   (2) *Other Writers’ works*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Futabatei Shimei</td>
<td>1887</td>
<td><em>Ukigumo</em> (The Drifting Cloud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futabatei Shimei</td>
<td>1888</td>
<td><em>Aibiki</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futabatei Shimei</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td><em>Ukigusa</em> (The Floating Grass)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higuchi Ichiyō</td>
<td>1895-6</td>
<td><em>Takekurabe, Nigorie</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayama Katai</td>
<td>1903</td>
<td><em>Jūemon no saigo</em> (The Death of Jūemon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayama Katai</td>
<td>1907</td>
<td><em>Futon</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td><em>Maihime</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1909</td>
<td><em>Vita Sexualis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td><em>Seinen</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td><em>Gan</em> (The Wild Goose)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td><em>Hyaku monogatari</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td><em>Okutsuya Goemon no isho</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td><em>Gojōgahara no adauchī</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td><em>Sanshō dayū</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1915</td>
<td><em>Saigo no ikku</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td><em>Takasebun</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arishima Takeo</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Aru onna (A Woman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Hakai (Broken Commandment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Haru (Spring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Ie (House)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Chikumagawa no sukechī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Sakurano mino jukusuru toki (When Cherries Ripe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1918-9</td>
<td>Shinsei (A New Beginning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>Aru onna no shōgai (The Life of A Woman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Sannin (Threesome)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Nobijitaku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td>Shokudō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>Arashi (A Storm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shimazaki Toson</td>
<td>1929-35</td>
<td>Yoakemae (Before Dawn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokuda Shūsei</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Shukuzu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<ONLINE TEXTS>

(1) Aozora bunko (Aozora Collection) [http://www.aozora.gr.jp](http://www.aozora.gr.jp)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Utakata no ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1891</td>
<td>Fumidukai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaki Kōyō</td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>Tajō takon (A Sensitive Man)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izumi Kyōka</td>
<td>1899</td>
<td>Tsuya monogatari (The Wake)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsume Sōseki</td>
<td>1901</td>
<td>London shōsoku (LONI) (Letters from London)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozaki kōyō</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>Konjiki yasha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masamune Hakuchō</td>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Izuko e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natsume Sōseki</td>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Omoidasu koto nado (Things I Remember)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanizaki Junichirō</td>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Himitsu (The Secret)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Tsuge Shirōzaemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Sahashi Jingorō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1913</td>
<td>Abe ichizoku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Yasui fujin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Kuriyama Daizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Oshio Heiichirō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mori Ogai</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td>Sakai jiken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Japanese Text Initiative, University of Virginia Library  
[http://etext.virginia.edu/japanese/](http://etext.virginia.edu/japanese/)  
Ueda Akinari, 1777. Ugetsu monogatari.

(3) Kokuritsu kokkai toshokan denshi tosho. [www.ndl.go.jp/jp/data/endl.html](http://www.ndl.go.jp/jp/data/endl.html)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsuga Teishō</td>
<td>1750</td>
<td>Hanabusa zōshi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jippensha Ikku</td>
<td>1802</td>
<td>Ukiyo dōchū hizakurige</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikitei Sanba</td>
<td>1809</td>
<td>Ukiyo buro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shikitei Sanba</td>
<td>1812</td>
<td>Ukiyodoko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamenaga Shunsui</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>Shunshoku umegoyomi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyokushanjin</td>
<td>1835</td>
<td>Kanabunshō musume setsuyō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsubouchi Shōyō</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>Tōsei shosei katagi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morita Shiken</td>
<td>1889</td>
<td>Tantei Yūberu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**<BOOKS>** (In alphabetical order)


1908. Kanraku.
1909. Shukuhai.
1909. Shin kichiōsha no nikki,
1910. Reishiō.
1927. Kashima no onna.
1931. Tsuyu no atosaki.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Publication Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Aru asa.</td>
<td>Shiga Naoya</td>
<td>1911. Sobo no tameni, 1913. Ko o nusumu hanashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Abashiri made</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912. Nijudai ichimen, 1913. Yamori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1909</td>
<td>Aru ichi peji</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912. Kurudhsasu no nikki, 1913. Yadokari no shi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Kamisori</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912. Seigia, 1914. Yama no ki to daija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Kare to mustsu toshiue no onna</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912. Kugenuma ko, 1914. Gakyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>Nigotta atama</td>
<td></td>
<td>1912. Seib to hyotan, 1918. Danpen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Rorin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913. Dekigoto, 1919. Yume</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>Fusuma</td>
<td></td>
<td>1913. Han no hanzai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kyokutei Bakin, 1805. Shosetsu Hiyokubun.
Kanwatei Onitake, 1807. Fukushu Shigetatsuwasawa.
Ikkeian Shisei, 1809. Fukushu kidan Shichirigahama.
Koeda Shigeru, 1809. Koya kamisori.
Jippensha Iku, 1810. Adauchi onna jitsukogyo


1909. Shisei.
1911. Hōkan.
1911. Himitsu.
1917. Itansha no kanashimi.
1919. Haha o kouru ki.
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