

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series (P&BNS)

Pragmatics & Beyond New Series is a continuation of *Pragmatics & Beyond* and its Companion Series. The New Series offers a selection of high quality work covering the full richness of Pragmatics as an interdisciplinary field, within language sciences.

Editor

Anita Fetzer
University of Würzburg

Associate Editor

Andreas H. Jucker
University of Zurich

Founding Editors

Jacob L. Mey
University of Southern
Denmark

Herman Parret
Belgian National Science
Foundation, Universities of
Louvain and Antwerp

Jef Verschueren
Belgian National Science
Foundation,
University of Antwerp

Editorial Board

Robyn Carston
University College London

Sachiko Ide
Japan Women's University

Deborah Schiffrin
Georgetown University

Thorstein Fretheim
University of Trondheim

Kuniyoshi Kataoka
Aichi University

Paul Osamu Takahara
Kobe City University of
Foreign Studies

John C. Heritage
University of California at Los
Angeles

Miriam A. Locher
Universität Basel
Sophia S.A. Marmaridou
University of Athens

Sandra A. Thompson
University of California at
Santa Barbara

Susan C. Herring
Indiana University

Srikant Sarangi
Cardiff University

Teun A. van Dijk
Universitat Pompeu Fabra,
Barcelona

Masako K. Hiraga
St. Paul's (Rikkyo) University

Marina Sbisà
University of Trieste

Yunxia Zhu
The University of Queensland

Volume 202

Soliloquy in Japanese and English
by Yoko Hasegawa

Soliloquy in Japanese and English

Yoko Hasegawa

University of California, Berkeley

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia

CHAPTER 4

Gendered speech in soliloquy

4.1 Introduction

While all the languages of the world would likely induce their male and female speakers to talk somewhat differently, Japanese is particularly well known for its conspicuously differentiated gendered speech styles.¹ That is, Japanese spoken by men and by women is frequently differentiated morphosyntactically. Since the late 1970s, this Japanese gendered language, particularly so-called *women's language*, has attracted a considerable amount of attention from researchers in anthropology, gender studies, linguistics, psychology, and sociology, e.g. Ide 1979a, Jugaku 1979, Komatsu 1988, Ide and McGloin 1991, Ide and Terada 1998, Nakamura 2001, Okamoto and Smith 2004, Inoue 2006, and Sasaki 2006, to name just a few. Based on these intensive investigations, an increasing number of researchers have concluded that the alleged characteristics of Japanese gendered language are not grounded in empirical observations of the way Japanese men and women actually speak. Rather, it is firmly associated with language ideology as well as the public persona with which the speaker wishes to present him/herself.² Furthermore, it

1. I will use the terms *sex* and *gender* to refer to closely-related but nevertheless distinct concepts, although the conceptual distinction itself is not a focus of attention in this study. *Sex* is considered a biological and binary categorization based on reproductive potential, although Blackless et al. (2000) estimates that approximately 1% of new-born babies have neither standard male nor female bodies. *Gender* is a social construct that is learned and performed by the members of the society (West and Zimmerman 1987). Eckert and McConnell-Ginet (2003:4) cites Goffman's (1977) episode of our conscious selection when walking into a public toilet as an example of doing gender. Unlike sex, gender is not a binary category; one's appearance and act can be perceived as more masculine or feminine than others'. Certain sex-linked words depend for their meanings on cultural stereotypes: feminine/masculine, manly/womanly, fatherly/motherly, brotherly/sisterly, etc. These words' meanings may vary from culture to culture and even within a culture. The topic of this chapter is essentially the relationships between gender – not sex – and linguistic expressions. Nevertheless, I consider it appropriate to mention that the experiment subjects whose soliloquies will be discussed do not have visible discrepancies between their sexes and their gender identities.

2. Silverstein (1979: 193) defines linguistic ideologies as “any sets of beliefs about language, articulated by the users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.”

has been and is being argued that researchers tend to analyze the native ideology of language use as though it were an objective description of the relationship between linguistic forms and social context (Silverstein 1979). And this *is* often the case in analyses of gendered speech in Japanese. Therefore, it is of interest to scrutinize how such gendered language manifests itself in soliloquy, where no addressee or bystanders influence the speaker's selection of "gendered" expressions.

Chapter 4 undertakes an investigation of this unexplored territory. After illustrating the morphosyntactic differences by use of anecdotal examples in the balance of this section, I will explain in Section 4.2 the prescriptive and stereotyped gendered language, which will be followed in Section 4.3 by its historical development. Section 4.4 presents gendered language appearing in the experimental soliloquy data; Section 4.5 introduces the concept of *indexicality*, which has been gaining popularity in the study of gendered language. Section 4.6 is devoted to a discussion of two problems associated with a double-layered indexicality analysis when it is applied to our soliloquy data; Section 4.7 provides a chapter summary.

Gendered speech in Japanese usually occurs as, or in the selection of, (i) first person pronoun, (ii) sentence-final particle, (iii) interjection, (iv) exclamatory expression, (v) honorific, (vi) vowel coalescence in pronunciation, or (vii) gendered vocabulary. For example, (1) is normally understood as a female utterance due to the use of the exclamatory interjection *ara* (with a falling pitch contour), which is normally used only by women.

- (1) *Ara omoshiroi.*
oh interesting
'Oh, it's interesting.'

By contrast, when uttered by a speaker of the Tokyo dialect – also called *hyoojungo* 'standard Japanese' or *kyootsuugo* 'common Japanese' – (2) is normally interpreted as a male utterance because of the male first person pronoun *ore*.³

- (2) *Ore kaeru.*
I go-home
'I'm going home.'

Combined with its elaborate honorific system (discussed in detail in Chapter 5), Japanese gendered language makes possible the depiction of a multi-party conversation without overt identification of each speaker. Japanologist Edward

3. During the Edo period (1603–1867), *ore* was used by both male and female commoners in Tokyo (then called *Edo*). However, women, especially those belonging to an upper class, began to avoid its use. As a consequence, it became a male first-person pronoun (Komatsu 1988: 94–95). In some of today's dialects, *ore* is still gender neutral.

Seidensticker (1989: 145), who translated numerous Japanese novels, including *Genji monogatari* 'The Tale of Genji', remarked that if the following conversation were made by four interlocutors – Maude, George, Aunt Margaret, and Uncle John – it would be impossible to record it in English without labeling who said each line:

- (3) "You didn't!"
"Oh, yes, I did."
"But why?"
"Can't you guess?"
"Because I loved her."
"You should have told me."

This conversation must be written in English along the lines of (4):

- (4) "You didn't!" exclaimed Maude.
"Oh, yes, I did," said George.
"But why?" wondered Aunt Margaret.
"Can't you guess?" said Uncle John.
"Because I loved her," responded George.
"You should have told me," said Aunt Margaret.

In Japanese, on the other hand, adroit selections of gendered language and honorific expressions make this sequence of utterances comprehensible without overt reference to any of the interlocutors. Interpreting the topic of this piece of conversation to be an extramarital affair on the part of George, Maude's husband, I would translate it into (5) if the explicit mention of the speakers were to be omitted:

- (5) a. *Nanimo nakatta -tte itte yo.*
nothing happened QUOT say SFP
'Please tell me nothing has happened.'
- b. *Jibun o osaeru koto ga dekinakattanda.*
self ACC control NMLZ NOM could-not
'I couldn't control myself.'
- c. *Demo dooshite desu no.*
but why COP SFP
'But why?'
- d. *Omaesan niwa wakaran no kane.*
you for understand-not NMLZ SFP
'You don't understand?'

- e. *Soko made ano hito o sukini*
 that much that person ACC like
natte-shimattanda.
 have-became
 'I fell so in love with her.'
- f. *Semete watakushi niwa itte-kudasaru beki*
 at-least I to tell ought-to
deshita wane.
 was SFP
 'You should have at least told me.'

In (5a), the *te*-form (the adverbial inflection of a verb + the conjunctive particle *te*) followed by the sentence-final particle *yo* is said to occur only in casual female speech. (The male speech counterpart is *itte kure yo*, where *kure* is the imperative form of *kure-ru* 'give'.) In (5b), *dekinakatta-n-da* – the past tense of *deki-nai* 'cannot do' followed by the abbreviated form of the nominalizer *no* combined with the abrupt ending with the copula *da* – is normally judged as in male-speech style; the female speech counterpart is *dekinakatta-no (yo)*. In (5c), *desu no* – the conjunction of the addressee honorific version of the copula and the sentence-final particle *no* – implies that the speaker is a female who speaks gracefully, or stand-offishly. In (5d), the use of *omaesan* 'you', *wakar-an*, a negative form of *wakar-u* 'understand', and the combination of *ka* and *ne* point to an elderly male speaker. In (5e), *shimatta-n-da* is in the same construction as in (5b). Regarding (5f), use of *watakushi* in casual conversation is considered female speech; the use of the referent honorific *kudasaru* 'give' determines the speaker to be a genteel (or aloof) woman. This utterance also contains the addressee-honorific, *deshita*, which in casual conversation is more likely to be used by female speakers than by male speakers, and the combination of the sentence-final particles *wa* and *ne* is another characteristic of stereotypical female speech.

The significant fact here is, however, that when native speakers of Japanese read (5), they are likely to regard it as an excerpt from a novel rather than a transcript of a real conversation. In other words, those gendered speech markers described above are more literary conventions than reflection of real-life speech.

Kinsui (2003) calls such social-identity markers, including gendered language, *yakuwari-go* 'role language, stereotyped language', i.e. indicators of stereotyped, often fictitious, speech styles useful for depiction of a particular social role. The use of such language automatically identifies the character's relevant social role and, therefore, can save lengthy characterization of each character

in a novel. Even best-selling novelists of today occasionally produce ideologically and culturally constructed stereotyped language that is unheard of in real modern-day life.

Kinsui (2003:30–32) cites novelist Yoshinori Shimizu's opinion regarding stereotyped language. Shimizu perceptively asserts that Japanese conversations in a novel are written in language created specifically to fulfill certain functions in novels. If the writer depicts utterances of a supporting character (i.e. non-protagonist) as if transcribing a real, tape-recorded conversation, too much weight will be placed on that character and the story-line will be ruined. Therefore, if, for example, a male supervisor in a novel asks his subordinate to carry out a task, it is considered appropriate and indeed conventional to write in stereotyped language, e.g. *Kyoojuu ni yatte-oite kure-tamae* 'Please complete this today' because the reader will get the conveyed information without paying special attention to the actual locution of the utterance. (This stereotypical male imperative, *tamae*, will be explained shortly.)

Kinsui begins his exposition with what he calls *hakase-go* 'doctor's language' (referring to a doctor as a learned person, not a medical doctor), illustrated in (6):

- (6) [From the comic book series, Tetsuwan Atomu 'Astro Boy']
Oya ja to? Washi wa Atomu no oya-gawari
 parent COP QUOT I TOP GEN surrogate-parent
ni nattoru wai.
 to has-become SFP
 'Parent? I've been Atomu's surrogate parent.'

Ja (a variation of the copula), *washi* (a first person pronoun), *oru* for *iru* as in *natt-oru* (cf. *natte-iru*), and *wai* (a sentence-final particle) invariably lead native speakers of Japanese to identify the speaker as an elderly man. Furthermore, in such entertainment genres as *manga* 'comics', most stereotypical doctors speak in this way, although it is unlikely that doctors speak in such a manner in reality.⁴ This chapter investigates Japanese gendered speech as role language as well as a reflection of reality.

4. A parallel might be drawn between role language and the so-called "royal *we*," e.g. *We are not amused* (= *I am not amused*), supposedly uttered by Queen Victoria. Although royal *we* is virtually obsolete, "it is very much alive in the 'royalese' of satirical journalism, parody and caricature, a crude symbol of royalty ..." (Wales 1996:64).

4.2 Morphosyntax of Japanese gendered language

One version of the traditional, prescriptive categorization of male and female expressions is provided in Table 1 (adopting and modifying Masuoka and Takubo 1992, similar to Suzuki 1993; illustrative sentences have been constructed by myself).⁵

Table 1. Traditional male vs. female language

	Male speech	Neutral speech	Female speech	Gloss
copula <i>da</i>	<i>Kore wa kumo da</i> (+ <i>yo/ne/yone</i>).		<i>Kore wa kumo</i> ∅ <i>yo/ne/yone</i> .	It's a spider.
<i>noka/noda</i>	<i>Itta noka.</i> <i>Naze itta-n da(i).</i>		<i>Itta no?</i> <i>Naze itta no?</i>	Did you go? Why did you go?
plain form + <i>yo</i> ⁶	<i>Kore omoshiroi yo.</i>		<i>Kore omoshiroi</i> <i>wayo.</i>	This is interesting.
imperative	<i>Kopii shiro.</i>	<i>Kopii</i> <i>shite/shinasai.</i>		Copy it!
negative imperative	<i>Kopii suru na.</i>	<i>Kopii shinaide.</i>		Don't copy it!
desiderative	<i>Kopii shite kure.</i> <i>Kopii shite moraitai.</i>	<i>Kopii shite</i> <i>kurenai?</i>	<i>Kopii shite</i> <i>hoshii no.</i>	I want you to copy it.
interrogative	<i>Shiai mi ni iku ka(i).</i>	<i>Shiai mi ni iku?</i>		Are you going to the game?
final particle	<i>Ame ga furu zo/ze.</i>		<i>Ame ga furu wa.</i>	It's going to rain.
interjection	<i>oi, kora</i>		<i>ara, maa</i>	
pronoun 'I'	<i>ore, boku, oira,</i> <i>washi</i>	<i>watashi, watakushi</i> (formal)	<i>atashi</i>	
pronoun 'you'	<i>omae, kimi</i>	<i>anata, anta, otaku,</i> <i>sochira</i>		

This type of categorization should be understood in such a way that if an utterance were transcribed and subjected to judgment as to whether its speaker is male or female (with no further contextual information given), most native speakers of Japanese would determine it to be male if the speech form falls in the male-speech category, or female if the form falls in the female-speech category. If the form is included in the neutral category, such a judgment would be impossible.

5. I will use interchangeably *women's language*, *female language*, *female-style expressions*, and *feminine language* as opposed to *men's language*, *male language*, *male-style expressions*, and *masculine language*.

6. Plain form: the finite form of a predicate without the auxiliary *masu* or *desu* (cf. Chapter 5).

There are many variations of gendered-speech categorization. Okamoto and Sato (1992) posit five categories: *strongly masculine*, *moderately masculine*, *neutral*, *moderately feminine*, and *strongly feminine*, as illustrated by Table 2. One way to interpret their categorization is as follows: when moderately masculine forms are used by a female speaker or when moderately feminine forms are used by a male speaker, such utterances may not necessarily draw special attention from the hearer(s) with respect to gendered behavior; however, when strongly masculine or strongly feminine forms are used by the opposite sex, they will necessarily be considered marked use of language, and the hearers are likely to make some inference regarding the potential motivation of such marked selections.

Table 2. Okamoto and Sato's categorization (slightly modified)

Strongly masculine	Moderately masculine	Neutral	Moderately feminine	Strongly feminine	Gloss
<i>Iku ze</i> <i>Iku zo</i>	<i>Iku yo</i>	<i>Iku (+ mon)</i>	<i>Iku no</i>	<i>Iku wa</i> (+ <i>ne/yo</i>)	I'm going.
		<i>Iku kana</i>		<i>Iku kashira</i>	I wonder if he's going.
					Go!
					Don't go!
		<i>Ikoo ka</i>			Shall we go?
					You're going, right?
	<i>Ashita da</i> (+ <i>ne/yo/yone</i>) <i>Ashita nan da</i> (+ <i>ne/yo/yone</i>)	<i>Ashita</i>	<i>Ashita ne</i>	<i>Ashita da wa</i> (+ <i>ne/yo/yone</i>) <i>Ashita yo</i> <i>Ashita nano</i> (+ <i>ne/yo/yone</i>)	It's tomorrow.
		<i>Ashita ja nai?</i> <i>Ashita jan</i>			It's tomorrow, isn't it?
				<i>Kinoo datta</i> <i>wa (+ yo/yone)</i>	It was yesterday.
	<i>Ashita daroo</i>		<i>Ashita deshoo</i>		It's probably tomorrow.
<i>Chotto matte</i> <i>kure</i>		<i>Chotto matte</i>	<i>Chotto matte ne</i>		Wait a moment.
<i>Atsui na</i>		<i>Atsui ne</i>		<i>Atsui wa ne</i>	It's hot, isn't it?
<i>Shiranee</i>				<i>Shiranai wa</i>	I don't know.
<i>Shiranai no</i> <i>ka yo</i>		<i>Shiranai no?</i>			Don't you know that?!
			<i>Oishiin datte</i>		I hear it's delicious.

Regarding prescriptive categorizations of gendered speech, it is unreasonable to expect that native speakers of Japanese uniformly agree with any of them in toto. Nevertheless, such categorizations represent the intuition of many native speakers, and most native speakers agree with the classification of most of the expressions cited above.

4.3 Origins and development of gendered language in Japanese

Gendered speech in the Japanese language originated in ancient times. Sei Shonagon (ca. 966–1017), for instance, wrote in her celebrated collection of essays, *Makura no sooshi* ‘The Pillow Book’, that men’s and women’s language would sound different even when they conveyed an identical meaning.⁷ However, scholars generally agree that in those early periods, gendered speech must have exhibited considerably fewer distinct morphosyntactic traits than those found in modern times (Mashimo 1969). A woman in those days expressed her femininity by not initiating a conversation, by not completing utterances, and by muttering to herself rather than clearly articulating (Sato 2006: 110–111).

During the Muromachi period (1392–1568), the distinction between masculine and feminine language became clearer. For instance, women would use honorific markers – e.g. the verbal auxiliary *masu* – more frequently than men would (Mashimo 1969: 9–10). This period also witnessed the development of so-called *nyooboo kotoba* ‘court ladies’ language’, whose lexicon included many vocabulary items still in use by modern women, e.g. *ohiya* ‘ice water’, *ogushi* ‘hair’, *omiashi* ‘legs’, *oshiru* ‘soup’, *otsumu* ‘head’.⁸

Although the tradition of differentiating men’s and women’s language has ancient roots, most of the stylistic characteristics of men’s and women’s languages as we know them today emerged in the Meiji period (1868–1912) (Komatsu 1988, Inoue 2004, 2006, Nakamura 2006). In order to demonstrate this development, Komatsu (1988) compares the sentence-final particles that appear in dialogues in Shikitei Sanba’s *Ukiyoburo* ‘Floating-World Bathhouse’ published in 1809–1813 (during the Edo period, 1603–1867), with those in Natsume Soseki’s *Sanshiroo*,

7. *Koto kotonaru mono. Hooshi no kotoba. Otoko onna no kotoba. Gesu no kotoba niwa kanarazu moji amari shitari* (from the *Nooinbon* version of *Makura no sooshi*). In his book, *The Pillow Book of Sei Shonagon*, Ivan Morris translates this passage as: *Different ways of speaking. A priest’s language. The speech of men and of women. The common people always tend to add extra syllables to their words.*

8. In my experience, *ohiya* ‘ice water’ is used by both sexes when ordering water in a restaurant.

published in 1909 during the Meiji period. *Ukiyoburo* depicts conversations of diverse groups of people in terms of age, occupation, region, sex, and social class, whereas *Sanshiroo*’s characters are young intellectuals of both sexes. A subset of the data compiled by Komatsu is presented in Table 3, where “MW” indicates that the form was used by both men and women, “M” exclusively by men, and “W” exclusively by women. *Da* is the copula in its indicative non-past form; “∅” indicates absence of sentence-final particles; “N” stands for a noun.

Table 3. Usage shifting of sentence-final particles

Sentence final form	<i>Ukiyoburo</i> 1809–1813	<i>Sanshiroo</i> 1909	Sentence final form	<i>Ukiyoburo</i> 1809–1813	<i>Sanshiroo</i> 1909
<i>da-∅</i>	MW	M	<i>~wa</i>	MW	W
<i>da-na</i>	MW	M	<i>N-ne</i>	MW	W
<i>da-ne</i>	MW	M	<i>N-yo</i>	MW	W
<i>da-yo</i>	MW	M	<i>da-te</i>	M	
<i>da-ze</i>	MW	M	<i>da-tene</i>	M	
<i>da-zo</i>	MW	M	<i>da-e</i>	W	
<i>~na</i>	MW	M	<i>da-noya</i>	W	
<i>~sa</i>	MW	M	<i>da-yonee</i>	W	
<i>~ya</i>	MW	M	<i>da-yonoo</i>	W	
<i>~ze</i>	MW	M	<i>N-nee</i>		W
<i>~zo</i>	MW	M	<i>~nano</i>		W
<i>da-wa</i>	MW	W	<i>~none</i>		W
<i>~no</i>	MW	W	<i>~wane</i>		W
<i>~noyo</i>	MW	W	<i>~wayo</i>		W

Table 3 clearly indicates that gender divergence became more prominent in the Meiji era. That is, during Meiji many previously gender-neutral particles became gendered, used exclusively by either male speakers or by female speakers. For instance, *zo* was used by both sexes in *Ukiyoburo*, as shown in (7a), which is uttered by the female bathhouse owner greeting female customers, but this particle is used exclusively by men in *Sanshiroo*. (Note that the honorific prefix *o-* in *o-genki* ‘healthy’ co-occurs with *zo* in (7a), which in today’s Japanese is an unacceptable combination because *zo* is characterized as a casual-to-vulgar male particle.) On the other hand, *noyo* is used exclusively by women in *Sanshiroo*, but it is used by both sexes in *Ukiyoburo*, as shown in (7b), where it is uttered by a man to his friends.

- (7) a. *Itsumo ogenki de ii zo.*
 always healthy COP good SFP
 'Good to see you are well!'
- b. *Katsu ga iu ni wa, kiden ga ii to iu noyo.*
 NOM in-saying you NOM good QUOT say SFP
 'According to Katsu, you'd be suitable.'

Many researchers contend that the present-day gendered language was *invented* in the Meiji period, during Japan's early modernization. By 1880, innovative features of the speech preferred by elitist, male, secondary-school (equivalent to today's high school) students had begun to play a pivotal role in shaping modern gendered language. In (8), *kimi* 'you', *boku* 'I', and *tamae* 'do (imperative)' exemplify novel *shosei kotoba* 'schoolboys' language', which shaped modern-day men's language to a great extent (Tanaka 1988: 8).

- (8) a. *Kimi ga chakufuku shita ni chigainai.*
 you NOM embezzle no-doubt
 'You must have pocketed it.'
- b. *Kore dake ga boku no inochi no tsuna da.*
 this only NOM I GEN life GEN rope COP
 'Only this is my lifeline.'
- c. *Kakusazu dashi-tamae.*
 not-hiding show (IMPERATIVE)
 'Don't hide it. Show it to me!'

Even more influential than *shosei kotoba* was *jogakusei kotoba* 'schoolgirls' language' in the formation of modern-day women's language. *Jogakusei* referred to "girls and young women of the elite classes who attended the women's secondary schools that had been instituted as part of the early Meiji modernization project inspired by Western liberal Enlightenment thought" (Inoue 2006: 38). Because of the high frequency of the sentence-final expressions *teyo* and *dawa* in it, *jogakusei kotoba* was also called *teyo-dawa kotoba* (Tanaka 1988: 8), which (9) exemplifies.

- (9) a. *Yoku-tte yo.*
 good SFP
 'It's OK.'
- b. *Ara iya da wa.*
 oh disagreeable COP SFP
 'Oh, I don't like it.'
- c. *Iku koto yo.*
 go NMLZ SFP
 'I'll go.'

- d. *Kuru kashira.*
 come I-wonder
 'I wonder if she will come.'
- e. *Okkuu da to omou noyo.*
 bothersome COP QUOT think SFP
 'I think it's a nuisance.'

To conservative ears, schoolgirls' speech sounded cacophonous, and, consequently, it was widely criticized and characterized as vulgar by intellectuals and newspaper columnists. Nevertheless, by 1890, such style had spread even to upper-class women, and by 1900 this new style had become well established as a more general and inclusive women's language (Komatsu 1988: 102–106). This vibrant women's language was quickly disseminated through its adoption in novels and magazines. The mere fact of being printed and circulated bestowed upon it prestige and authority (Inoue 2006: 126). By the 1930s, it had been promoted to the ideal female speech style and begun to be put into practice by upper-middle class women (p. 133).

4.4 The data

Of the 3,042 utterances in our soliloquy data, 2,050 were uttered by the 16 female speakers (ages between 20's and 50's), and 992 were uttered by the 8 male speakers (seven in their 20's and one in his 40's).

4.4.1 Female soliloquies

Out of the 2,050 utterances by the female subjects, only 76 (3.7%) involved so-called female-style expressions, as exemplified in (10) and summarized in Table 4. (The first numbers within square brackets in (10) indicate frequencies of occurrence; the second numbers indicate the number of subjects who used the designated expression.)

- (10) Female-style expressions
- a. *watashi/atashi* (casual female 1st person pronoun) [21, 10]
Nihon ni moo 3 nen kaette nai kedo, doo
 Japan to already year return not but how
shiteru kanaa. Watashi wa anmari nihon ni
 doing SFP I TOP not-much Japan to
kaeranai kara, un, mukashi no tomodachi
 return-not because yeah old-days GEN friend

ga doo shiteru ka anmari wakaranai shi.
 NOM how doing Q much know-not and
 'I haven't returned to Japan for 3 years. What are they doing, I wonder.
 Since I don't go back to Japan so frequently, I don't know how my old
 friends are doing.'

Ii na, Reeku Tahoe. Uun, atashi-tachi mo jikan
 good SFP Lake Tahoe we also time
ga attara ikerun dakedo ne.
 NOM there-is can-go but SFP
 'Lake Tahoe is nice. We can go there too if we have time.'

- b. The beautifier prefix *o* + NP [15, 5]

[Looking at a magazine]

Nan te iu o-hana nan daroo.
 what QUOT say flower I-wonder
 'I wonder what this flower is called.'

[Thinking about what to do during the summer]

O-uchi no naka mo sukoshi katazuketai shi.
 house GEN inside also little organize also
 'I also want to do a little work inside the house.'

- c. Referent honorifics [10, 2]

[Speaking about her in-laws]

Ano futari wa nee, Reeku Tahoe ni mo yoku
 that two TOP SFP Lake Tahoe to also often
irassharu kara.

go (RH) because

'They are like ... because they often go to Lake Tahoe.'

Kono kakejiku wa donata ga okakinatta no kanaa.

this scroll TOP who (RH) NOM wrote (RH) NMLZ SFP

'Who wrote this scroll?'

- d. *kashira* (sentence-final particle) [9, 4]

Konshuu wa atsuku naru no kashira.

this-week TOP hot become NMLZ

'I wonder if it's going to be hot this week.'

[Looking at a book in the office]

Atarashii hon kashira. 96 nen, uum.

new book year hmm

'Is it a new book? 1996, hmm'

- e. NP + (*yo*)*ne* (sentence-final particle) [6, 6]

[Shopping for an ottoman in a mail-order catalog]

Nandaka minna onaji yoo na kakko ne.
 somewhat all look-alike shape SFP
 'Somewhat. They all look the same.'

[At the beginning of recording]

Jaa, kore o motte, nani o shabereba ii
 well this ACC holding what ACC if-talk good
koto yara. Muzukashii. Yappa hoogen de
 NMLZ SFP difficult as-expected dialect in
shaberu no ga futsuu yone.

speak NMLZ NOM normal SFP

'Well, holding this [microphone], what shall I talk about? Difficult. It's
 natural to speak in my dialect, I think.' [Subjects were not required to
 hold the microphone.]

- f. *none, noyone* (sentence-final particle) [6, 5]

A, nanka shizuka ni shiteru to ironna oto ga
 oh somewhat if-being-quiet various sound NOM
kikoeru none.

I-can-hear SFP

'Oh, if I don't do anything, I can hear a lot of things.'

[Looking for reviews of computer speakers in a magazine]

Rebyuu ga yomitai noyone.

review NOM want-to-read SFP

'I want to read a review.'

- g. *soo ne* (interjection) [5, 3]

[Thinking about what to do on the day following work]

Ato wa, soo ne, ano hen no seeri shiyoo kana.
 then that vicinity GEN organization will-do SFP

'And then, well, I may want to clean in there.'

- h. *wa* (sentence-final particle) [3, 2]

Nihon wa atsukatta kedo, ii wa, kariforunia wa suzushikute.

Japan TOP was-hot but good SFP California TOP cool

'It was hot in Japan, but it's cool in California. That is good.'

- i. Sentence-final *koto* (nominalizer) [1, 1]

Konaida moratta kiku no hana, maa, yoku motta koto.
 recently received chrysanthemum INTJ well lasted NMLZ

'How long the chrysanthemums they gave me have lasted!'

Table 4. Female-style expressions (UT = total number of utterances)

Subj	UT	(w)atashi	o-NP	HON	kashira	(yo)ne	no(yo)ne	soone	wa	koto	Total
B	68	2		7	2		1				12
C	122	1									1
D	161	1	6	3	3	1	1	1	1		17
F	97	1			2						3
G	76	2	3								5
H	188	6				1			2	1	10
I	175		1								1
J	117					1					1
K	172	1				1	1				3
M	90		2					3			5
O	124	2	3								5
P	119	2									2
S	127	3			2	1					6
V	145										0
W	142						1				1
X	127					1	2	1			4
Total	2,050	21	15	10	9	6	6	5	3	1	76

According to Masuoka and Takubo (1992), *watashi* in (10a) is gender-neutral, while *atashi* is female speech. Although male speakers can utilize *watashi*, its use is restricted to a formal register. In casual conversations, as well as in soliloquy, males do not use *watashi*. In this chapter, I therefore categorize *watashi* as a female-style expression.

The beautifier prefix *o-* in (10b) is distinct from the honorific prefix *o-* in that the former can be used for one's own belongings, whereas the latter cannot be: e.g. *ano kata no o-uchi* 'the house of that person (with the beautifier prefix)' vs. *watashi no o-uchi* 'my house (with the beautifier prefix)' vis-à-vis *ano kata no o-namae* 'the name of that person (with the honorific prefix)' vs. **watashi no o-namae* 'my name'. Both prefixes are used by both sexes, but the distribution of the beautifier *o-* is very limited in male speech (Shibatani 1990:374). Male speakers normally say *o-cha* 'tea', *o-kane* 'money', *o-kome* 'rice', among others, but they rarely say *o-hana* 'flower', *o-soto* 'outside', or *o-uchi* 'house' in their casual speech. Admittedly, this judgment is highly subjective; however, no male subject in the present experiment used the beautifier prefix *o-*. Thus, my categorization of it as a female expression seems justified.

Regarding referent honorifics in (10c), its use is, of course, not gender specific (see Chapter 5 for details about honorifics). However, because women are said to use honorifics more frequently than men do (e.g. Usami 2006), and because the male subjects in my experiment did not use referent honorifics at all, I have included referent honorifics in women's language along with the beautifier *o-*.

Kashira in (10d) is categorized by Okamoto and Sato (1992) as strongly feminine. NP + *(yo)ne* in (10e) is judged by Masuoka and Takubo as female speech. Okamoto and Sato consider NP + *ne* as moderately feminine, while *none* and *noyone* in (10f) are strongly feminine. *Wa* in (10h) is (strongly) feminine in both Masuoka and Takubo's and Okamoto and Sato's categorizations. It is important to note here that the forms listed in (10) were never used by male subjects in the present experiment.

As seen in Table 4, women's soliloquies rarely contained female-style expressions. Rather, they routinely use expressions traditionally considered male-style. For instance, the forms in bold face in (11–13) are traditionally labeled as male forms (e.g. Mizutani & Mizutani 1987, McGloin 1991), or what Okamoto and Sato (1992) refer to as moderately masculine sentence-final forms.

- (11) A *ano, hawai ni atta zenmai mo*
 oh that Hawaii in there-was flowering-fern also
oishikatta nee. Chotto nihon no, nihon de
 was-delicious SFP a-little Japan GEN in
te ni hairu zenmai to chotto chigaunda kedo, ano
 obtainable with is-different but that
zenmai oishikatta nee. Aa, demo, hawai de ichiban
 but in most
oishikatta no wa, aaa, hawai no papaiya.
 was-delicious one TOP GEN papaya
Sorekara mango. Nee, hawai de torero mango
 then INTJ harvested
tabetai naa. Un, maa, papaiya wa kotchi
 want-to-eat SFP yeah well TOP here
demo, ma, mekishiko-san no papaiya dattara
 also but Mexican GEN if-it-is
te ni hairu kedo, yappa, chotto chigaunda yonee.
 obtainable but nevertheless a-little is-different SFP
 'That flowering fern I ate in Hawaii was also delicious. It's a little different from the flowering fern we can buy in Japan, but it was delicious. But the most delicious foods in Hawaii were papayas. And mangos. I want to eat a mango from Hawaii. Yes, we can buy papayas from Mexico here, but they are a little different.'

(12) *Yakimono kaa. Shoogakkoo-n tokini chotto dake*
 pottery SFP elementary-school-GEN when a-little only
yatta kurai kana, rinkan-gakkoo nanka de. Nanka,
 did about SFP summer-camp like LOC somewhat
saikin soo iu geejutsu-kankee toka ni
 recently that-kind art-related alike to
furetenai kamo naa. A, demo, bijutsukan itta
 not-be-exposed may-be SFP oh but art-museum went
na. Are itsu datta kana. Ni-shuukan, sanshuukan
 SFP that when was SFP two-weeks three-weeks
mae da. Soo da. Minna ga kiteta toki ni ittan da.
 ago COP yes everyone NOM visiting when went
 ‘Pottery ... I made only a few pieces when I was in elementary school, during
 summer camp. I guess I’m not exposed to art nowadays. Oh, I went to an art
 museum. When was that? Two weeks ... it was three weeks ago. That’s right.
 We went there when they visited us.’

(13) *Uun, yappari, daigakuin itta hoo ga ii no*
 hmm as-predicted graduate-school go better NMLZ
kana. Kitto, toshi da na. Moo chotto, MBA no koto
 SFP probably age COP SFP more a-little about
shirabete miyoo kana. Gakubu kankee nakattara, bijinesu
 investigate SFP major if-irrelevant business
mejaa ja nakutemo yokattara, ikeru kamo shirenai shi.
 major not if-ok can-go may-be
GPA aru shi. Demo, Amerika dattara, mata, toshi da
 I-have but America if again age COP
na. 2-3 nen tatchaun da yona.
 SFP 2-3-years pass SFP
 ‘Hmm, better go to a grad school? The problem then will be my age. Shall I
 check on MBA programs? If my undergrad major is irrelevant, I might be
 admitted without a business degree. And I have a good GPA (grade point
 average). But (if I look for a job) in the U.S., my age will be a problem again.
 Two or three years pass so quickly.’

Claiming the forms highlighted in bold face in (11–13) to be male language may elicit the strange conclusion that women normally soliloquize in the male speech style. Therefore, it seems more reasonable to conclude that for contemporary women, these highlighted expressions are neutral, not gendered forms at all, perhaps at a subconscious level. (These subjects do use female variations in conversation.) We will return to this discussion in Section 4.6 below.

Table 5. Traditional gender variations of the expressions appearing in (11–13)

Male language	Female language	Gloss
<i>oishikatta nee.</i>	<i>oishikatta wanee.</i>	It was delicious.
<i>tabetai na.</i>	<i>tabetai wane.</i>	I want to eat it.
<i>chigaun da yonee.</i>	<i>chigau no yonee.</i>	They are a little different.
<i>yakimono ka.</i>	<i>yakimono ne.</i>	Thinking about pottery ...
<i>yatta kurai kana.</i>	<i>yatta kurai kashira.</i>	I made only a few ...
<i>furetenai kamo naa.</i>	<i>furetenai kamo nee.</i>	I’m not exposed to ...
<i>itta na.</i>	<i>itta wane.</i>	I went to ...
<i>itsu datta kana.</i>	<i>itsu datta kashira.</i>	When was that?
<i>sanshuukan mae da.</i>	<i>sanshuukan mae da wa.</i>	Three weeks ago.
<i>soo da.</i>	<i>soo da wa.</i>	That’s right.
<i>ittan da.</i>	<i>ittan da wa.</i>	We went there ...
<i>toshi da na.</i>	<i>toshi da wa ne.</i>	It’s the age.
<i>2-3 nen tatchaun da yona.</i>	<i>2-3 nen tatchau no yone.</i>	2-3 years pass quickly.

Related to this issue, author Dorothy L. Sayers (1883–1957) said:⁹

“A man once asked me ... how I managed in my books to write such natural conversation between men when they were by themselves. Was I, by any chance, a member of a large, mixed family with a lot of male friends? I replied that, on the contrary, I was an only child and had practically never seen or spoken to any men of my own age till I was about twenty-five. ‘Well,’ said the man, ‘I shouldn’t have expected a woman ... to have been able to make it so convincing.’ I replied that I had coped with this difficult problem by making my men talk, as far as possible, like ordinary human beings. This aspect of the matter seemed to surprise the other speaker; he said no more, but took it away to chew it over. One of these days it may quite likely occur to him that women, as well as men, when left to themselves, talk very much like human beings also.” (Sayers 1971:48–49)

Sayers seems to emphasize that men’s and women’s speech are less different from each other than the readers think when they are freed from social pressure. And, as in our experimental data, markers which Sayers’ reader thought of as “masculine” were not masculine, but merely unmarked forms.

9. Eve Sweetser drew my attention to this quotation.

4.4.2 Male soliloquies

Even when I discarded as neutral most of what is traditionally categorized as men's language, male subjects in the present experiment used gendered speech slightly more frequently than female subjects did, although the current male sample population of eight is too small to make reliable generalizations. The number of occurrences of male-style expressions was 67, or 6.8%, of the total of 992 male utterances (compared with 3.7% of female-style expressions used by the female subjects). However, so-called men's language used exclusively by male subjects was very rare; only first person pronouns fell in this category. All but one male subjects consistently used *ore*, more casual pronoun than *boku*. The subject who used *boku* never used *ore*.

(14) "Men's language" used exclusively by male subjects

a. *ore* (male 1st person pronoun) [20, 5]
[Speaking about the calligraphy scroll hanging on the wall]
Ore mo shodoo wa kirai da shi.
I also calligraphy TOP dislike and
'I don't like calligraphy either.'

b. *boku* (male 1st person pronoun) [3, 1]
Ma, Reegan no koto wa boku wa waruku
well Reagan GEN thing TOP I TOP badly
itakunai kara ...
do-not-want-to-say because
'I don't want to say bad things about Reagan, so ...'

"Men's language" almost exclusively used by male subjects is indicated below:

(15) a. Vowel coalescence used by male subjects [12, 3]

Aa, maguro ga kuitee. (*kuitee* < *kuitai*)
well tuna NOM want-to-eat
'I want to eat tuna.'

Hara hetta naa. Aa, kyoo wa yuumeshi
hungry SFP well today TOP dinner
kuenee ya, kono ato iroiro aru kara. (*kuenee* < *kuenai*)
cannot-eat SFP this after various there-is because
'I'm hungry. But I won't be able to eat dinner because I have a lot of things to do after this.'

Mendokusee naa. (*mendokusee* < *mendokusai*)
troublesome SFP
'It's troublesome.'

b. Vowel coalescence used by a **female** subject [1, 1]

Hayaku nihon ni kaeritee. (*kaeritee* < *kaeritai*)
soon Japan to want-to-return
'I want to go back to Japan soon.'

c. Suppletion (formally unrelated word) used by male subjects [7, 3]

Kono gurai dekai tsukue ga hoshii. (*vis-à-vis ookii* 'big')
this about big desk NOM want
'I want a big desk like this.'

... *yappa oya, nanka, oya no*
as-expected parent somewhat parent GEN
tsukutta meshi ga kuitai kanaa.
made meal NOM want-to-eat SFP
(cf. *gohan vis-à-vis meshi, tabetai vis-à-vis kuitai*)
'I want to eat meals made by my parent.'

d. Suppletion used by a **female** subject [1, 1]

A dekkai Koojien. (cf. *ookii*)
oh big
'Oh, it's a big *Koojien* dictionary.'

"Men's language" used by both sexes in the present experiment is listed below. Given that there were twice as many female subjects as male subjects, the distributions clearly indicate that these expressions are favored more by males than by females.

(16) "Men's language" used by both sexes

a. *yona* (sentence-final particle) used by male subjects [18, 5]
[Worrying about whether his speech was recorded properly]
Chanto haitteru yonaa.
properly recorded SFP
'I hope it's been recorded OK.'

b. *yona* (sentence-final particle) used by female subjects [9, 4]

Kyoo tesuto ga owatte kara, uchi ni kaette,
today test NOM finish after home to return
nereba yokatta naa. Yojikan wa, yojikan no
if-slept would-be-good SFP 4-hours TOP GEN
kyuukei wa nagai yonaa.
break TOP long SFP
'Today, I should have gone home after the test and slept a little. Four hours, a four-hour break is too long.'

- c. *kane* (sentence-final particle) used by male subjects [7, 2]
Rinakkusu no ii tokoro wa nan nano kanee.
 Linux GEN good place TOP what COP SFP
 'I wonder what the advantage of a Linux installation is.'
- d. *kane* (sentence-final particle) used by female subjects [6, 2]
Yoshie wa doo shiteru kanee.
 TOP how is-doing SFP
 'I wonder how Yoshie's been doing.'

Table 6. Male-style expressions (UT = total number of utterances)

Subj	Sex	UT	<i>ore</i>	<i>boku</i>	V.coales	Suppl	<i>yona</i>	<i>kane</i>	Total by M	Total by F	Total
A	M	76	3		3				6		6
B	F	68									
C	F	122									
D	F	161									
E	M	196					10	5	15		15
F	F	97									
G	F	76									
H	F	188						5		5	5
I	F	175					3			3	3
J	F	117									
K	F	172									
L	M	162	9		7	5	1		22		22
M	F	90									
N	M	102	1			1			2		2
O	F	124					2			2	2
P	F	119				1	1			2	2
Q	M	172		3			1		4		4
R	M	35			2				2		2
S	F	127			1			1		2	2
T	M	105	3				4	2	9		9
U	M	144	4			1	2		7		7
V	F	145					3			3	3
W	F	142									
X	F	127									
Total		3,042	20	3	13	8	27	13	67	17	84

There are many more expressions traditionally claimed to be male language (e.g. NP + *da* 'It is NP', *daroo na* 'I guess ...', Adj + *yone*); however, as discussed in Section 4.4.1, they are equally frequently used by both sexes in our soliloquy data. Therefore, I do not categorize them as male language in this study.

To summarize this section, it can be said that in soliloquy, only first person pronouns are strictly gender specific. Vowel coalescence and suppletion are strongly masculine, although women can occasionally use them. The final particle *yona* is not strongly masculine, but its distribution is nevertheless highly skewed towards male language. By contrast, the distribution of *kane* is less skewed, although still more common among male speakers. These distributions clearly show that gendered language categorization is by no means clear-cut.

4.5 Indexicality and linguistic ideology

In recent years, the number of studies conducted on pragmatics in general and gendered language in particular has greatly increased. For the most part, these studies have been based on the idea of *indexicality* – the relationship between a linguistic expression and its context, following the work of Charles Sanders Peirce (1839–1914) (Peirce and Hoopes 1991). (For a succinct overview of this trend, see Kataoka 2002).

Indexicality is defined as: a sign *A* indexes information *C* when the occurrence of *A* can imply the presence or existence of *C* (Lyons 1977: 106). For example, when we say "Smoke means fire," *smoke* is an index that implies the presence of fire. The presence of *ore* in a Japanese utterance implies that the speaker is male as well as that the speech situation is casual, or, if the speaker is a woman, that the speech is in a dialect such as that of Saitama prefecture, where *ore* is used by both sexes.

In the past, such information as the speaker's sex/gender, geographical origin (identified as a regional dialect), and social class membership was considered to be the *evoked meaning* of particular linguistic expressions. In this view, sociocultural information is considered part of the linguistic expressions themselves. By contrast, indexicality analyses assume that this type of information is not part of sentence meaning per se. Instead, language *practice* is considered to involve *indexing*, or pointing to a multiplicity of sociocultural significances (or one might prefer calling them sociocultural meanings), including the spatiotemporal locus of the communicative situation (deixis, cf. Chapter 3), social identity, social acts (e.g. speech acts), social activities (e.g. sequences of social acts, disputing, storytelling), and affective and epistemic stances (Ochs 1996: 410).

To investigate indexical meanings, “it is important to distinguish the range of situational dimensions that a form (set of forms) *potentially* indexes from the range of situational dimensions that a form (set of forms) *actually* indexes in a particular instance of use.” The indexical potential “derives from a history of usage and cultural expectations surrounding that form,” whereas actual indexing is uniquely configured by the participants in the communicative setting using the situational information provided by the form (p. 418).

Ochs (1993, 1996, Ochs and Schieffelin 1989) and those adopting her idea of indexicality consider that affective stances and social acts are *direct* indices (i.e. the pragmatic meaning of a linguistic expression), while gender and social relations are *indirect* indices. Ochs analyzes Japanese sentence-final particles *ze* and *wa* as *directly* indexing affective stances of coarse versus delicate intensity. These affective stances in turn *indirectly* index gender and gender images of masculinity and femininity.

The grammar and phraseology of soliloquy are yet to be investigated thoroughly, but soliloquy appears to have indexing potential that differs slightly from that applying to dialogues. For example, like *ze*, the final particle *zo* in a dialogue is commonly attributed to male speech, expressing a strong determination and/or assertion. However, in soliloquy women can use it without exerting masculinity, e.g. *gambaru zo!* ‘I’ll make it!’, *makenai zo!* ‘I won’t be defeated!’. It only indexes coarse intensity, as Ochs contends. (Being interactional, as widely claimed, *ze* does not occur in soliloquy.) Another example that exhibits a similar discrepancy is *yoshi*, as in *yoshi dekita* ‘ok, I’m done’. In a dialogue, this phrase, too, is normally considered male speech, but in soliloquy, it also sounds natural when said by a woman. This might indicate that certain expressions are so strongly assertive that women are discouraged from using them publicly.

Subscribing to Ochs’ distinction of direct and indirect indexicality, S. Okamoto (1997) nevertheless points out that Ochs’ formulation lacks an explicit mechanism that relates the pragmatic meaning of a linguistic form (direct indices) to social, contextual information (indirect indices). Okamoto acknowledges that women sometimes use “masculine” forms, not because they want to sound stereotypically masculine, but because the directness or assertiveness (i.e. the pragmatic meanings) of such forms indirectly indexes intimacy rather than roughness or lack of femininity. She further argues that the selection of indexical expressions is strategically made according not only to the speaker’s consideration of multiple social aspects of the context (e.g. sex, age, intimacy, genre, speech-act type), but also to his/her linguistic ideology (i.e. beliefs and attitudes concerning language use). Based on their perception of multiple social aspects of the context as well as their ideology, speakers employ linguistic expressions that they consider most appropriate in each situation.

Regarding gender ideology, Okamoto (1997:808) cautions that contemporary Japanese women’s language is “a constructed category based on ... the idealized speech style of traditional women in the upscale Yamanote area of Tokyo.” She says that most dialects of Japanese do not morphosyntactically differentiate gender, but in the process of ideology formation, dialects are totally ignored, regarded as substandard language variations. Consequently, prescribed women’s language has come to be regarded as that which “proper” women are expected to use. “It is thus class-based and normative, representing the hegemonic linguistic and gender ideology” (ibid.) Women’s speech styles that do not conform to this ideologically established norm are subject to criticism: not feminine, unattractive, evidence of ignorance, and symptomatic of improper upbringing.

Socially dominant ideologies certainly influence speakers’ strategies of language use, Okamoto continues, but it is also important to distinguish particular beliefs about language use from actual distribution of linguistic forms. She reports that most of the subjects in her study do not use prescribed gendered language in daily conversations; rather, they normally use what she refers to as *moderately masculine* speech style (p. 799) (*default speech style* in my terminology; cf. Section 4.4.1). Actual language use is not always consistent with the dominant ideology because of the complexity of each social context and also because of the diversity of linguistic ideologies that mediate the indexical process. Individuals may have different ideas about language use and may create various relationships between linguistic forms and social context.

I agree with Okamoto in that various ideologies influence selection of linguistic forms in each utterance. However, it is difficult to believe that the selection of forms in soliloquy is *strategically* made, because, in the absence of an addressee, it is extremely difficult to imagine the intended goal which such a strategy could possibly be aiming at. Without explicit evidence documenting conscious and strategic uses of gendered forms in soliloquy, it is more plausible to interpret our experimental data in such a way that female speakers, perhaps at a subconscious level, simply do not consider most of the traditionally-defined masculine forms as masculine at all. Rather, they consider such forms to be *unmarked, default* forms, and these forms can be used when there is no outside pressure to use something else.

It has also been reported in recent years that gendered speech is not really as clear cut as had been assumed, and that there is significant variability among women, according to their age, geographical origins, and speech situations, as claimed by the articles included in Okamoto and Smith (2004). However, my discovery in this soliloquy study is quite different in its nature. I find that women *invariably* use default (i.e. most of so-called moderately masculine) forms throughout their soliloquies, regardless of their age, geographical origins, and the speech

styles they normally employ in social conversations. Considering the absence of any addressee as well as the uniformity among our female subjects' utterances, it is unlikely that this choice is strategically made in order to accomplish any specific goal. I therefore claim that so-called moderately masculine forms of Japanese are not masculine at all: they are gender-neutral.¹⁰

Another factor to consider is diachronic change. For more than 20 years, I rarely had occasion to watch/listen to Japanese media – motion pictures, television dramas, and theatrical productions. Then, for this study, I recently examined random examples of more than 50 of these cultural media. I have found that, while the speech of male characters does not exhibit noticeable changes, that of female characters has conspicuously changed. Most female characters publicly use the default form, and do so much more frequently than their cohorts did more than two decades ago. I conjecture that Japanese women have been soliloquizing in the current default form for a long time. Women's speech has not formally changed, but, rather, women's application of the default form has expanded from the private into the public domain.

4.6 Discussion

To recapitulate, Ochs hypothesizes that “gendered” language does not directly index the speaker's gender perspective, but, rather, indexes such affective stances as coarse and delicate intensity, and that these affective stances, in turn, indirectly index the speaker's gender characteristics and images. Therefore, women can employ “masculine” forms, not necessarily to express masculinity, but to express an affective stance of directness or assertiveness, heretofore restricted and attributed to men.

When applied to soliloquy, two problems are identified in this line of analysis. One is that, contrary to Ochs's contention, there seems to be no flexibility in the choice of first person pronouns; invariably, male subjects used either *ore* or *boku*, whereas female subjects used *watashi* or *atashi* in soliloquy. In other words, these pronouns can directly index speakers' gender identities. Another problem is its inability to account for the asymmetrical distribution of “masculine” and “feminine” forms. That is, while women might use “masculine” forms to emphasize such attributed masculine characteristics as coarseness, men do not use “feminine” forms to convey gentleness. In this section, we will reexamine our soliloquy data with respect to these two issues.

10. An anonymous reviewer has commented that if “strategy” means only *communicative* strategy in a dialogue as in the sense of Okamoto, this claim is plausible, but if “strategy” could also mean achieving certain goals, the use of *zo* in *ganbaru zo*, for instance, could be interpreted as achieving some specific goals.

4.6.1 First person pronouns

When examining gendered language in soliloquy, we need to separate the first person pronouns from all other alleged gendered expressions, because these pronouns are, without exception, indicative of the speaker's gender, whereas the distributions of other expressions are only skewed toward one gender to various degrees.

Interestingly, Nakamura (2001) reports the same phenomenon in Japanese children's acquisition of what she calls *gender-appropriate language*. Observing 12 boys and 12 girls, between ages three and six, Nakamura recognizes that when speaking with their mothers, Japanese boys tend to use gender-neutral forms (although Okamoto and Sato would categorize them as moderately masculine forms), but when speaking with same-sex peers, they use more masculine forms (p. 18). The following conversation is between two boys, M (5;3) and H (5;0), pretending to be a storekeeper and a customer in a shop. H uses the masculine second person pronoun, *omae*, and the epithet, *baka* ‘fool’, albeit jokingly. These are expressions that he is unlikely to use when speaking with his mother (p. 26, Nakamura's translations are slightly modified).

- (17) H: *Kore mo da, kore mo.*
 this too COP
 ‘This too, and this.’ ((putting things in basket, approaching M, the storekeeper, with money in hand))
- M: *Aa, boku no mono, boku no.*
 eh I GEN thing
 ‘Hey, it's my money, mine.’ ((looking for his own money, thinking H took it))
- H: *Omae, koko ni aru daroo? Baka, funde*
 you here LOC be COP (PRESUMP) fool step-on
doo surun da yo.
 what do COP SFP
 ‘Isn't that yours, there? Stupid. What are you doing stepping on it?’
 ((laughing, pointing to money under M's foot))

By contrast, girls tend to use what Nakamura considers gender-neutral forms in both types of situations – with their mothers and with their peers alike – with the occasional use of feminine forms (p. 18). The following is another roleplay between two girls in a store, A (5;1) and N (5;0). *Atashi kore ne* ‘I'll take this’ in A1 involves feminine language, whereas the forms in N1, N2, and A2 can be marked as moderately masculine according to the prescriptive norm.

- (18) A1: *Sore ja ne, atashi kore ne.*
 then I this SFP
 'So then, I'll take this.'
- N1: *Chotto, narabete kara da yo.*
 wait line-up after COP SFP
 'Hey, first we have to line things up.'
 [snip]
- N2: *Sore ja, ikko shika kaenai yo.*
 that with one only buy-not SFP
 'With that, you can buy only one.'
- A2: *Iku yo.*
 go SFP
 'Here I go!' ((attempting to start playing))

According to Nakamura, even as early as three years of age, Japanese children have already acquired metalinguistic awareness of gendered language,¹¹ and are corrected by peers more frequently than by their mothers when gender-inappropriate language is used. For example, a 4-year-old girl was criticized by her peers when she said *umai naa!* 'this is delicious!' using the masculine vocabulary, *umai*, for 'delicious' vis-à-vis the neutral form *oishii*, which her female peers immediately rejected as inappropriate. Likewise, a 3-year-old boy was frequently teased by his male peers for using the feminine sentence-final particle *wa*. "Peers often assure the observance of gender-stereotyped norms by teasing and taunting the child who fails to conform" (p. 34).

Nakamura acknowledges:

"Gender-distinctive language is not a fixed, cross-situational individual trait, but rather something that occurs in the context of particular types of social interactions and relationships. Therefore, it is obvious that language should not be labeled 'feminine' or 'masculine,' suggesting that boys and men use only one form and girls and women use another." (p. 36)

Nevertheless, she also recognizes some persistent gender-based linguistic differences:

"... we need to distinguish between the linguistic features most closely tied to the speaker's gender identity as male or female (i.e. linguistic features that are used all the time) and those that relate to specific role-situational constraints to be socially masculine or feminine (i.e. linguistic features that vary according to one's stance as

11. Sakata (1991) reports that as early as two years of age, children have developed sensitivity to gender differences indexed by sentence-final particles.

influenced by contextual and situational constraints; Kitagawa 1977). For example, even when girls are engaged in rough-and-tumble play in an aggressive manner, they do not use masculine first person pronouns such as *ore* and *boku*, although they might use masculine sentence-final particles such as *zo* and *ze*. This occurs because some gender-based linguistic forms seem to be linked more closely to the fixed gender identity of the speaker than others, and incorrect use of some linguistic forms is more marked than incorrect use of others." (p. 37)

Young children's self-referring expressions start to emerge at about one year four months to ten months (Maeda and Maeda 1983: 20–64). Children first use their own names – e.g. *Sakashi*, *Aya-chan*, *Iroshi-tan*, *Maa-kun* – mimicking how others call them. They then start using first person pronouns around one year seven months to ten months. (Some of Maeda and Maeda's subjects do not use a first person pronoun even when they reach two years of age, however.)

Ide (1979b) investigates how self-referential terms are selected by Japanese and American children under age six and reports that both interpersonal and intrapersonal factors play a pivotal role. The former concerns the social attributes of the addressee (e.g. same-sex friend, adult family member), whereas the latter is the speaker's psychological or behavioral attributes (e.g. self-assertion, dependency, active play) (p. 277). In the case of Japanese, if the addressee is a same sex friend and the psychological state of the boy speaker is solidarity-conscious and wanting a boyish conversation, *ore* will be selected.

Focusing on the speaker's psychological or behavioral attributes, Ide identifies the neutral choice for a boy as *boku*. If he wishes to express dependency, *boku-chan* or his own first name is selected. If he is assertive, his own name, with or without *chan*, is used, whereas if he is swaggering, *ore* is used (p. 278). If a girl wishes to express her dependency on the addressee, she uses her own name with or without *chan*. If she feels dependent and the need to imitate boys, she uses *boku* or *boku-chan*. If she wishes to show her independence and maturity or formality, she uses *watashi*, *atashi*, or *watakushi* (p. 280).¹² We normally observe that, as children mature, they cease to use their own name (with or without *chan*) or *boku-chan*, leaving *boku* and *ore* for males, and *watashi*, *atashi*, and *watakushi* for females.¹³

As in the case of children's speech, there is no cross-sex variability in the selection of first person pronouns in adults' soliloquy: men use *ore* or infrequently *boku*, whereas women use *watashi* or *atashi*. This fact poses a problem with Ochs'

12. Although Ide reports it to be an attested example, the use of *watakushi* by young children sounds odd to me.

13. In casual conversation, many female speakers use their own first name to refer to themselves even in their twenties and thirties. Such use of one's first name might be interpreted merely as habit, rather than the speaker's intention to convey her dependency on the addressee.

two-tier analysis of indexicality. According to her model, when a woman feels a strong emotion such as anger, we expect her to use *ore* in her soliloquy. (Of course, as mentioned above, *ore* is gender neutral in some dialects; in such a case, it is a different story.) By contrast, when a man experiences a tender emotion such as affection, he would have the option to use *watashi* or *atashi* in his soliloquy. But to the naked ear both cases sound preposterous. As Nakamura points out, first person pronouns are strongly tied to one's gender identity, and, therefore, more reasonable to regard as direct indices of that identity.

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, there appeared to be no discrepancies between any of our experiment subjects' socially acknowledged sexes and their gender identities. Given that selection of first person pronoun is most deeply seated within one's gender identity, discovery of how persons whose sex and gender identities differ manipulate first person pronouns in their soliloquies can be extremely insightful.

4.6.2 Asymmetry in gendered language

Another problem with Ochs' model of indexicality in language use is its inability to account for the asymmetry observed in the present soliloquy data. Recall that all feminine expressions listed in Section 4.4.1 were used exclusively by female subjects, whereas all masculine expressions, except for the male first person pronouns, were used by both sexes, with the frequency of women's usage varying considerably.

Regarding this issue, Nakamura (2001: 20) also communicates virtually identical traits among young children. She writes,

“Girls often were willing to play with many of the toys that boys typically play with (e.g. blocks), but it was difficult to get boys to play with toys associated with girls (e.g. tea sets). This tendency increased with age. Boys sometimes were willing to try girls' toys when playing with their mothers but refused to do so when playing with other boys.”

She also notes that girls can be assertive and rough, using masculine linguistic forms, but boys normally do not use feminine forms with their same-sex peers (p. 35).

Why does this pronounced asymmetry arise if so-called men's and women's languages do not directly index gender or gender images of masculinity and femininity, but, rather, different yet gender-neutral affective stances? There must be some factors that motivate women to use masculine expressions, but discourage men from using feminine expressions. Before undertaking this inquiry, let us confirm two different approaches to the study of gendered linguistic behavior.

The two commonly recognized approaches utilize either the *dominance* framework or the *difference* framework (Cameron 1998: 215–221).¹⁴ The dominance framework claims that male dominance in society is reflected upon, as well as the major cause of, gendered language (e.g. Lakoff 1975, Fishman 1983, West and Zimmerman 1983, 1987).¹⁵ Because of their lower status and the social pressure on them to “speak like a lady,” women tend to use more hedges, qualifiers, polite forms, etc. for conveying their unassertiveness and insecurities as well as trivializing their talk and accountability (Lakoff 1975). Dominance in power is not only attributed to individual males, but it is institutional power granted to them collectively by society. As such, gender differences occur in the context of cross-sex conversation (West and Zimmerman 1983, 1987).

The difference framework (e.g. Maltz andorker 1982, Tannen 1986, 1993) focuses more on linguistic “miscommunication” between the two sexes and concludes that dominance and power do not play a significant role in such “miscommunication.” This approach perceives men and women as belonging to different subcultures and having different-but-equally-valid rules of conversation acquired from same-sex social interactions throughout their adolescent years.¹⁶ Therefore, even when both men and women attempt to treat each other as equals, (sub)cultural miscommunication can occur.

Uchida (1992), however, strongly questions the validity of the anti-power-based difference framework when in reality the difference is male dominance, emphasizing that male dominance exists regardless of what the individual intends. She argues that while the difference approach appeals to our desire to believe in the equality of men and women, social equality in principle and social equality in reality are two different matters wherein the former does not guarantee the latter (p. 558).

Uchida also points out that miscommunication among peoples of different cultural backgrounds normally results in equally negative consequences. But this is not the case of miscommunication between men and women.

14. Cameron (1998) also mentions a third approach, the performance framework, although she does not discuss it in detail (cf. Goffman 1977, West and Zimmerman 1983, 1987, Coates 1991). In this approach, gender is something to be displayed or performed during a social interaction, rather than a reflection of individuals' inherent nature. If one's performance is deviant from social norms, negative sanctions await.

15. The categorization of references in each framework is strongly influenced by Cameron (1998), but may not necessarily be identical with hers.

16. Although not based on cross-sex “miscommunication,” Ide's (2006: 165–182) analysis also utilizes the difference framework.

“Whether manifested in the form of conversational rules, cultural values, possession of resources, or social norms, there is institutional power owned only by men that affects the result of miscommunication. Men’s power allows them to ‘misunderstand’ women’s meanings without getting penalized for it, and also gives them the right to penalize women for misinterpreting men’s behavior.”

(p. 562)

We now see a parallel between the difference framework and Ochs’ double-tiered indexing approach to gendered language. Neither can account for the asymmetry in linguistic behavior of males and females. In soliloquy, where social pressure is minimal, female speakers use masculine forms for expressing whatever attributes such forms bear, whereas male speakers do not use feminine forms at all. Similarly, girls use masculine forms when they are assertive and rough, but boys normally do not use feminine forms when they are gentle. In this regard, Uchida (1992: 560) writes:

“The observation of power structure can also be made when we look at the speech patterns acquired by girls and boys through same-sex interactions with peers. Girls’ principles of cooperation, collaboration, equality, sharing and relating and showing empathy perfectly coincides with the ‘typical’ female characteristics: nurturing, supportive, expressive, emotive, friendly, relationship-oriented, and other similar adjectives, which are also associated with ‘weakness’ and ‘powerlessness.’ Boys’ patterns, on the other hand, involve competing for and holding on to the floor, asserting, challenging, arguing, showing one’s dominance and verbal aggressiveness, which are associated with ‘powerful’ and ‘masculine’ traits.”

Given this asymmetry, is it desirable to maintain Ochs’s theory, postulating that certain expressions directly index tough intensity and power, while some other expressions directly index delicate intensity and powerlessness? The former combination may not sound unreasonable, but the latter combination comes across as arbitrary, unless we accept that the existence of *femininity* is what relates these traits. I, therefore, argue that so-called gendered language in Japanese is in fact gendered, certainly more gendered than many of the recent studies in the field claim.

To support this argument, I provide an anecdotal episode. When gendered language is discussed in my Japanese pragmatics course, I distribute two constructed and stereotyped conversations, one between two female interlocutors and the other between two male interlocutors. The opening lines of these two conversations are provided in (19) and (20):

(19) [Between two female speakers]

A: *Gobusata shichatte gomennasai ne.*
long-time-no-see sorry SFP
‘I’m so very sorry for my long silence.’

B: *Tondemonai. Kochira koso.*
don’t-mention-it this-side also
‘Oh, no. Not at all. Please. I’m the one who should apologize.’

A: *Denwa shiyoo shiyoo to omottetan dakedo,*
telephone do QUOT thought but
shujin ga shutchoo shitari, kodomo no
husband NOM business-trip did-and child GEN
juken ga attarishite ne.
entrance-exam NOM there-was SFP
‘I really meant to call you so many times, but my life has been so very hectic like my husband went on a business trip and my son had an entrance exam, and things like that.’

B: *Botchan, doo nasutte?*
son how did
‘Oh my. How did your son do?’

A: *Okagesama de, yatto hairemashita kedo, shinpai shite,*
fortunately at-last could-enter but worrying
oya mo ko mo yasechaimashita wa.
parent also child also lost-weight SFP
‘Well fortunately he passed that old exam but we were so worried about it so much that we both lost a lot of weight.’

B: *Ohairi ni narete, yokatta wanee. Botchan wa atama*
could-enter good SFP son TOP head
ga ii kara.
NOM good because
‘Congratulations! I just knew your son was so smart.’

A: *Maa, tondemonai.*
oh no-way
‘Oh, no. He isn’t. Not at all.’

(20) [Between two male speakers]

C: *Yamamoto, ashita no shiai mi ni iku kai.*
tomorrow GEN game see to go Q
‘Hey Yamamoto. You goin’ to the big game tomorrow?’

D: *Shiai? Yakyuu daroo?*
game baseball I-wonder
‘Game? What game? Baseball isn’t it?’

C: *Nn.*
yeah
‘Yeah that’s it.’

D: *Zenzen kyoomi nai ne.*
 at-all interest not SFP
 'Not interested.'

C: *Maa soo iu na yo. Ashita no ii rashii yo.*
 well so say not SFP tomorrow one good seems SFP
Tamaniwa tsukiae yo.
 once-in-a-while associate SFP
 'Don't say that. Tomorrow's game should be great. Come on. Be a friend.'

D: *Ashita wa moo yakusoku shichattan da yo,*
 tomorrow TOP already promise made SFP
oyogi ni ikutte.
 swimming for go
 'I'm already booked up for swimming, man.'

The contents of both conversations are equally trivial and boring. I ask two male students to read (19), a stereotyped female conversation, and when they do, everyone with an adequate level of fluency in Japanese laughs. By striking contrast, when two female students read (20), a stereotyped male conversation, no one laughs. This phenomenon is a manifestation of the covert power hierarchy operating between the two sexes. A powerful person's pretention to be powerless can evoke laughter, as a smart person can pretend to be a fool in order to make people laugh. By contrast, when a weak person pretends to be powerful, it is unlikely perceived as humorous.

When we consider Japanese culture, the hypothesis that "women's language" directly indexes delicate, gentle intensity loses its credibility even further. Japanese culture cherishes gentleness and empathy, typical feminine characteristics. Travis (1992, cited in Wierzbicka 1997: 276) surveyed personal characteristics that Australians and Japanese subjects value highly. The Australians respondents ranked *honest* (70%), *intelligent* (50%), *kind* (20%); the Japanese respondents' ranking was *yasashii* 'gentle' (77%), *akarui* 'cheerful' (68%), *omoiyari* 'empathy' (58%). When babies are born, many parents' first comment is *Omoiyari no aru ko ni natte ne* 'Please become a person with *omoiyari*' (ibid.). Given this cultural background, if the direct index of female language were gentleness, Japanese males' reluctance to use it would be inexplicable. I therefore conclude that Japanese "women's language" directly indexes the feminine gender image, which is considerably lower than the masculine gender image in the social hierarchy. This is why males refuse to use it, although it is also associated with gentleness – the characteristic they seemingly esteem so strongly.

4.7 Summary

Chapter 4 has provided an investigation of so-called gendered language in Japanese as it appears in soliloquy. After observing the major morphosyntactic characteristics traditionally and prescriptively categorized as gendered language, we reviewed its historical development. Most present-day gendered expressions were developed and disseminated during Japan's early modernization in the Meiji period (1868–1912), modeling at that time elitist male and female secondary-school students.

We then examined in Section 4.4 our soliloquy research data and found that utterances containing any gendered expression extremely rare: 3.7% of the 2,050 female utterances and 6.8% of the 992 male utterances. We also observed a striking difference between the two groups. Although rare in occurrence, feminine forms were used exclusively by women, whereas masculine forms, except for first person pronouns, were used by both sex groups. Yet another significant discovery was that (moderately) masculine forms occur so frequently in female soliloquies that they cannot and should not be categorized as such; otherwise, we would have to acknowledge an absurd conclusion, viz., women soliloquize in men's language.

In Section 4.5, we considered the concept of indexicality (relationships between linguistic expressions and sociocultural significances), including Elinor Ochs' two-tier model of indexicality, which considers that affective stances are directly indexed by linguistic forms, whereas gender and gender image are indirectly indexed and derived from affective stances. This model can elegantly account for such cases as women using masculine forms to express strength (not masculinity) in the form as determination or assertiveness. However, it fails to explain why male speakers do not use feminine forms to convey tender, delicate intensity of their assertions. As Travis (1992) reports, Japanese society esteems gentleness. Given that, Ochs' model leaves one puzzling as to why males refuse to use gentle expressions. This fact gives rise to the hypothesis that women's language directly indexes female gender image, whose attributes include a low ranking in the social hierarchy. This hypothesis can account for the asymmetry in distribution of gendered language among male and female speakers.