SILVA IAPONICARUM 日林

FASC. XII・第十二号

SUMMER ・夏

2007

Adam Mickiewicz University
Institute of Oriental Studies, Department of Japanese Studies

Warsaw University
Oriental Institute, Department of Japanese and Korean Studies

Posnaniae, Varsoviae, Kuki MMVII

ISSN 1734-4328

Drodzy Czytelnicy.

Zeszyt letni *Silva Iaponicarum* jest w całości poświęcony językoznawstwu. Zamieszczamy dwa teksty językoznawcze.

Polska japonistyka przygotowuje się do głównego wydarzenia tego roku – Międzynarodowej Konferencji Japonistycznej organizowanej z okazji 20-lecia studiów japonistycznych na Uniwersytecie Jagiellońskim w Krakowie oraz Uniwersytecie im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu. Odbędzie się ona w Centrum Sztuki i Techniki Japońskiej „Manggha" w Krakowie w dniach 24-28 października 2007. *Silva* także będzie tam obecna. Szczegóły wydarzenia można znaleźć w poniższym serwisie internetowym:

http://www.filg.uj.edu.pl/ifo/japonistyka/conference/.

Z nadzieją na spotkanie w Krakowie jesienią.

Kolegium redakcyjne   E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

Poznań-Warszawa-Kuki, czerwiec 2007

Dear Readers,

The summer fascicle of *Silva Iaponicarum* is wholy devoted to linguistics. We publish two texts on lingiuistics.

Polish Japanology is preparing to the main event of the year – The International Conference on Japanese Studies to celebrate the 20th anniversary of Japanese Studies at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow and at the Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. It will be orfanized in the "Manggha" Centre of Japanese Art and Technology on 24-28th of October 2007. *Silva* will also be there. Details of the event can be found in the following Web service:

http://www.filg.uj.edu.pl/ifo/japonistyka/conference/.

Hoping to meet you in Cracow in autumn.

The editorial board   E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

Poznań-Warsaw-Kuki, June 2007

読者のみなさまへ

Silva Iaponicarum 夏号は、言語学特集です。二本の言語学論文を掲載いたします。

ポーランドの日本学会は、今年度の主要な催しもの、ヤギェロン大学（クラクフ）とアダム・ミツキェヴィッチ大学（ポズナン）の日本学科創立 20 周年を記念する国際日本学会の準備を進めています。それは、10 月 24 日〜28 日に「マンガ」日本美術技術センター（クラクフ）で開かれます。*Silva* もまたそこに参加する予定です。催しの詳細については、下記のサイトをご覧下さい。

http://www.filg.uj.edu.pl/ifo/japonistyka/conference/

秋にクラクフでお目にかかれるものと信じつつ。

編集委員会　　　　　　　　　E-mail: silvajp@amu.edu.pl

　　　　　　　　２００７年6月　ポズナニ・ワルシャワ・久喜

Silva Iaponicarum 日林

Kwartalnik japonistyczny / Quarterly on japanology / 日本学季刊誌

Kolegium redakcyjne / Editorial board / 編集委員会

Rada naukowa / Research council / 研究顧問会

SPIS TREŚCI / CONTENTS / 目次

Arkadiusz Jabłoński

Modality, Honorifics, Meaning[*]

While modality and honorifics are commonly defined as concepts belonging to different levels of linguistic analysis, they reveal many similarities, which are too often overlooked. In this short theoretical paper, I would like to focus on such properties of modality and honorifics as the opposition between the propositional core and the modal or honorific content of the message, and to examine whether and to what extent the two concepts can be related to notion of psychological attitude of the speaker.

The concept of propositional core embodies the essence of binary approach to linguistic facts. I am of the opinion that such approach should not be used for the purpose of researching actual events related to acts of communication. Linguistics should be and can be useful as an applied science, examining not only binary oppositions regarding linguistic data treated out of context, but also actual language activity used to achieve certain goals. It is by no means my intention to undermine the concepts of modality and honorifics. The basic assumption of this paper is that it is possible and necessary, though it may require some effort, to use these notions as elements of a more general theory of communication, provided that they are defined by their qualitative features examined with regard to the context of utterance, not used solely as quantitative and context-free markers of "attitude of the speaker", whatever the latter term is intended to mean.

Words, Ideas and Actions

According to the scientific tradition, the difference between descriptive and applied science is that they define their scope of interest differently. Descriptive statements serve to "reproduce subsequent fragments of reality (social language conscience)" (Bańczerowski, Pogonowski, Zgółka 1982: 25-26), and may be basically based on the schema: "It is that r." Applied statements are rooted in descriptive methodology but they can also be of directive character and state: "If you want to achieve a goal g, perform the action a" (ibid.). In the field of pragmatic studies the difference between descriptive pragmatics and applied pragmatics could also be defined by the fact that the former examines general relations of sings and their

---

interpretations, and the latter observes actual relations of language behavior and its result and thus may enable us to handle actual communication situations better and achieve communication goals. For this reason it is important to note that traditional concepts of modality and honorifics may obscure more than they elucidate. Binary approach may be misleading, since it tends to use quantitative terms to examine whether "more" or "less" modality or honorifics is present in a context-free sentence, often neglecting context parameters and requirements of a communication environment. For the purposes of the applied approach it is not enough to examine linguistic material. As such, linguistics has to redefine its scope.

It is commonly acknowledged that the dichotomy between linguistic conscience on the language community level and actual application of utterances on the individual level is one of the most classic and basic dilemmas of linguistics. It was solved elegantly by structural approach, by de Saussure in his distinction of *langue* from *parole* and Chomsky in his opposition between *competence* and *performance*. Cognitive approach did not deny the elegance of the above distinctions but at the same time criticized them as relying too much on the Aristotelian pattern of *genus proximum* and *differentia specifica,* and developed instead the theories of Idealized Cognitive Models, prototypes and metaphors in its attempts to unify the usage with universal rules of categorization. It may be stated that cognitive revolution made it possible to venture a step forward in understanding pragmatic aspects of language usage defined as relations between signs and interpretations in terms of classic semiotic triad presented by Morris. The discussion to what extent the structural and cognitive properties of objects should be included into the scope of modern linguistic theory is in progress. As we can see from the following passage, however, it still seems hard to define how the interpretations of certain objective parameters of reality should be related to actual social actions.

"Austin (1962) seems to be responsible for the view that illocutionary acts are necessarily verbal acts. He has said (p. 119) that <<stating, informing (as distinct forms of showing), arguing, giving estimates, reckoning, and finding (in the legal sense)>> cannot be performed except by saying something. The same is true, he says, of <<the great majority>> of verdictiveness (*I take it that you are saying..., I find for the plaintiff*) and expositives (*I deny that I did it, swear that I didn't do it,* etc.). However, it does not follow from the fact that one

might have to use language to perform some action that what is most important about it is that it is performed verbally. One cannot kiss another person without closing one's lips together, drawing air into one's lungs, thereby creating a partial vacuum, and then releasing the bilabial constriction, but if we follow the suggested line of reasoning of Austin we will have to conclude that kissing is primarily, and most importantly, a bilabial, ingressive pulmonary act. It is a bilabial, ingressive pulmonary act, but it is also, and more importantly, a social action, ranging in significance from signaling sexual interest to showing affection, to communicating a greeting (the kissing that is done between celebrities on television shows), to communicating respect (as when someone kisses the hand of some royal woman). Kissing is, in short, a social action, even if it necessarily requires performance of a physical action. Precisely the same is true of requesting, offering, making threats, giving warnings, conveying information, requesting information, or uttering verdictives and expositives, etc. And, once one has recognized that communicative actions are social actions and that many types of communicative actions can be performed non-verbally, the temptation to associate these actions with particular linguistic forms diminishes greatly." (Geis 1995: 14-15)

The problem raised above is beyond reach of the autonomously defined linguistics in the sense that the character of social actions is intrinsically interdisciplinary. The need of interdisciplinary research is obvious regarding both the complexity of reality we have gradually become able to investigate due to the progress in natural sciences and vast amount of data that can be researched as linguistic corpora and data banks. In our times it is possible to get an extremely precise data on physical and mathematical parameters of kissing, articulation and other pulmonary acts as well as distance, frequency and speed of an object or an action. The speaker's attitude is slightly more difficult to investigate and control but progress is being made in this area as well. At the same time, there seems to be growing need to classify data into units relevant for a more general research (semantics, categorization, intercultural communication, human relations etc.). Linguists are also expected to provide data in the form useful for other applied disciplines (artificial intelligence, theory and practice of translation and interpretation including machine translation and

interpretation etc.). From this point of view, this paper is not only about relations between the concepts of modality and honorifics but also about how linguistic facts should be mapped on social facts. I have a strong conviction that contemporary linguistics can not only sustain the pressure from other disciplines but that it can indeed provide innovative and stimulating solutions. This would include both formulation of statements of the type: "If you want to achieve a goal *g*, perform the action *a*" quoted above and explaining communication behavior with the use of statements of the type: "*a* was performed to achieve *g*", where *a* and *g* serve as cultural variables that may differ in heterogeneous communication environments.

My personal view is neither structural nor cognitive. As a researcher in the field of intercultural studies and pragmatics, I experience the inadequacy of the classic structural approach. On the other hand it is clear, as pointed out by Wierzbicka (1999), that both prototypes and invariants should be taken into account in semantics. This applies in my opinion also to pragmatics. There seems to be nothing more disappointing in pragmatic research than the attempts to map the semantic and grammatical oppositions onto the parameters of context objects. Reality tends to be more complex than linguistic material in question. Moreover, if we have multicultural and multilingual material at our disposal, it may prove that many instances described in terms of modality and honorifics often cannot be mapped onto the relevant instances of researcher's native culture and language. This is also one of the reasons why linguistics, as an applied science, should seek explanations not based solely on linguistic material.

Dictum and *Modus*

The most basic definition of modality distinguishes the *dictum* (what is said) from *modus* (how it is said). In Japanese linguistics, the key terms concerning modality use the semantic unit *genpyō* 言表 meaning literally 'what is said.' The term *genpyōjitai* corresponding to *dictum* (and written 言表事態, where *jitai* means 'situation' or 'state of affairs') is opposed to *genpyōtaido* 言表態度 – which can be equaled to speaker's 'attitude' (Nitta 1991: 17). One has to note a significant shift in such approach from "what is said" (*dictum*) to "the situation mentioned" (*genpyōjitai*), the former of which might well have been written as 言表自体 'the statement itself.' It is not the purpose of this paper to investigate the graphemic peculiarities of modal terms in Japanese but this difference reveals a major flaw of the classic dichotomy on which the very concept of modality is based. The simplicity of the opposition between *dictum* and *modus* actually

14

clarifies much less than could be expected, restricting the range of modal research to the level of sentences deprived of context.

It is interesting to note that very similar distinction is made by Kikuchi (1997: 33) for Japanese honorifics (*keigo* 敬語) between *kihonteki imi* 基本的意味 'basic meaning' and *taigū imi* 待遇意味, the latter of which can be translated here as 'meaning of attitude.' Mizutani (1993: 8) divides Japanese sentences (*bun* 文) into *go* 語 'words' and *watai* 話体, the latter of which may be loosely translated as 'the conversational content' of a sentence. It should be mentioned here explicitly that these descriptions may be seen as a significant step forward in that they seem to overcome the limitations of the traditional normatively oriented definitions of Japanese honorifics which treat *keigo* as *kei'i o arawasu kotoba* 敬意を表す言葉 'words expressing respect.' Still, similarly as in the case of modality, the explanations of politeness related oppositions based solely on binary distinctions may function only on the level of words and sentences, if not provided with a tool for interpreting context parameters.

Linguistics and Communication

The issue whether abstract notions researched out of context should constitute the core of linguistic research is not new. One of many researchers to have raised it was Yngve (1975):

> "Linguistics is usually defined as scientific study of language. Language is defined as the relation between sound and meaning. This relation is expressed in terms of grammar and lexicon, which lay out the rules of the language, and implicitly or explicitly specify what expressions belong in the language and what expressions fall outside it. In linguistics, grammar and lexicon play the role of a unifying theory that serves to relate the phenomena to one another and explain them." (ibid.)

With emphasis being put on grammar and lexicon, linguistics cannot autonomously explain problems related to interaction. Modality and politeness are within the scope of linguist interest only because certain oppositions possible to be described on the level of grammar and lexicon are related to them. It is outside the scope of classic linguistic research to explain how these oppositions are related to the phenomena present and relevant in the actual communication environment. What Yngve proposes in his paper is a turn into a "broad linguistics" which he finally labels as "human linguistics", with its goal "to achieve a scientific understanding of

how people communicate" (ibid.). It is overtly postulated that human linguistics should include the elements of sociology, psychology and anthropology. Yngve provides simple examples in order to prove that communication between people is not a pure exchange of messages but primarily serves to change the participants into "different persons" with different "situational properties" (ibid.) than that before the act was initiated and performed. Supporting Yngve's view in this aspect, I will attempt to prove that such approach embodies the ability of linguistics to serve as an applied science, to make use of interdisciplinary knowledge base and to share its findings with other disciplines.

Speaker's Authority and Optional Content
According to Nitta's definition, *genpyōtaido* is influenced by modality (*modariti* モダリティ) and politeness (*teineisa* 丁寧さ) (Nitta 1991: 18). Mizutani relates his *watai* directly to style (*buntai* 文体; *sutairu* スタイル) . He also points out that the distinction between propositional and non-propositional meaning of a sentence is similar to the opposition of *koto* コト and *mūdo* ムード , where the former is explicitly defined as *kotogara* (事柄 with the English term *proposition*) and the latter as *shintekitaido* (心的態度) with the English term *modality* (Mizutani ibid.).

The overt use of the term *taido* 態度 'attitude' by Nitta and Mizutani and a great deal of other definitions emphasizes conscious and free decision of the speaker on what non-propositional meaning of an utterance, if any, should be added to its core. Kikuchi mentions *atsukai* 扱い, 'the [proper] treatment' of the partner (Kikuchi ibid.: 36), which is also under the speaker's authority.

It is the speaker who occupies central position in this distinction and it is the speaker's responsibility to control exchange parameters related to *keigo*. At the same time, the propositional content of the utterance is viewed as constant. Nitta points out that factors belonging to the area of attitude do not influence the quality of the proposition (Nitta ibid.: 186). Kikuchi states that the basic meaning of the utterance remains the same, despite the changes in the meaning of attitude (Kikuchi ibid.). According to Mizutani, words are entailed by *watai* in order to deliver the propositional core to the hearer (Mizutani ibid.).

The general conviction constituting the foundation of the above theories seems to be that some information may (or may not) be added by the speaker to the part of the message regarded as its core. The message core as such is not directly influenced by this additional content.

Binary Oppositions

In their already-classic theory of politeness (Brown, Levinson 1978) the basic oppositions in speaker's behavior are defined in terms of "FTAs." The essential choice is binary, between "Do the FTA" and "Don't do the FTA." When the former is chosen, it is the speaker who decides if the partner should be provided with the sole *dictum* or whether some redressive action is taken. The action is a clear addition to the *dictum*. There is no explicit suggestion that it is actually "politeness" or "high level of politeness" that should be regarded as a goal or a desired parameter of communication activity, but expressing the sole *dictum* is generally not recommended, as one can infer from the very wording of the following passage:

> "Doing the act baldly, without redress, involves doing it in the most direct, clear, unambiguous and concise way possible (for example, for a request, saying 'Do X!')." (ibid.)

A very similar distinction based on a binary opposition is made by Miyake (1999), who examines the relation between Japanese modality and politeness using the term *teineisa no kuwawatta shitsumon* 丁寧さの加わった質問 (lit.: 'questions with added politeness' although the content of the paper indicates that the author's concern are rather 'questions with increased politeness'). Miyake provides example 2. quoted below as "more polite" than 1. Note that English translations provided below are contextual rather than literal.

> 1. *Dochirasama desu ka.* どちら様ですか。('What is your name?')
> 2. *Dochirasama deshō ka.* どちら様でしょうか。('May I ask your name?) (ibid.)

Miyake states that *darō ka/deshō ka* element (considered "modal" and "indefinite") may literally be added to an "ordinary" Japanese question in order to make it more "polite." Such explanation is based solely on speaker's judgment and the value of "politeness" (*teinesa* 丁寧さ) is measured quantitively. The actual opposition is also close to binary ("0" for "less politeness" and "1" for "more politeness").

There is no explanation from Miyake on why should a speaker wish to make a message "more polite." There is also no clarification on why

should he ask hearer's name or on social relations between them. One gets an impression that "politeness" is related only to oppositions in Japanese lexicon and functions as a part of tacit knowledge of communication act participants on how the propositional core of the utterance should be modified. The existence of propositional core of the utterance is taken for granted. The remaining part of the utterance expresses speaker's attitude understood purely in terms of modality and politeness. In such approach the goal of linguistic activity is not researched. The messages are "polite" simply because "politeness" was added to them.

In a different set of examples provided by Miyake, the sentence 3. below is qualified as a mere "expression of request" fulfilling "necessary conditions for a request" by mentioning that "<<the speaker wants the hearer to be quiet>> in an indirect way." It is interesting to note that Miyake omits such expressions of Japanese as: *Shizuka ni！* 静かに！ 'Quiet!' or *Shizuka ni shiro！* 静かにしろ！ 'Be quiet!', although they might be considered to embody even in a more direct way the wish of the speaker that the hearer, whoever it may be, is quiet (One may note here jokingly that while in terms of Brown and Levinson the meaning of *Shizuka ni shiro!* could probably be defined as "Do X!", the meaning of *Shizuka ni!* could be expressed even shorter, as "X!" which makes it even more direct, clear, unambiguous and concise than the authors of the "politeness" theory could have imagined.). The reader is not informed about the reason of this omission but it can be guessed that the expressions in question are probably considered too "direct" and "impolite" to be researched. It is clear that one cannot compare "impolite" and "bald" statements with no redressive action taken against "polite" statements equipped with modality. It should probably also be clear that the "impolite" statements contain "no politeness" and correspond in their function to the propositional content of the message defined according to the classic theory of modality.

The example 3. below is "indirect" and 4., also provided with "indirectness," "more polite" than 5. According to the classic terms of Prague school 4. is considered "marked," bringing the effect of "politeness" which the "unmarked" sentences 3. and 5. lack.

3. *Shizuka ni shite hoshii.* 静かにしてほしい。('I would like you to be quiet').
4. *Shizuka ni shite kudasai.* 静かにしてください。('Please be quiet').
5. *Shizuka ni shite moraemasenka.* 静かにしてもらえませんか。('Could I receive a favor of you being quiet?') (ibid.)

One should note that it is possible to form a vast number of sentences with the same *dictum* and compare any two of them regarding their "directness." A good example of such list may be almost hundred Japanese versions of a sentence "You have forgotten your umbrella" provided by Wlodarczyk (1996: 251-255), any two of which, in a binary approach, may always be compared as "more or less polite." It is questionable, however, whether it is possible to explain with the use of binary comparisons based on "level of politeness" something really important about actual usage of selected phrases examined out of context.

What is *dictum*?

In a binary approach, the part of utterance defined in terms of modality or politeness depends solely on the definition of *dictum*. It may be convenient for the theoretical purposes to distinguish between *dictum* and *modus* in a context-free environment, but with the introduction of context it becomes extremely difficult to uphold the view that the very *dictum* does not express speaker's attitude.

The *dictum* content present in all actual messages is not only related to such notions as truth or validity of a statement. It inevitably influences also the relevance of the message, the flow of exchange and the recognition of a speech situation. In fact, not much can be explained with the traditional approach to modality about how messages are used as tools of communication. The expression of *dictum* must be regarded as a demonstration of certain attitude. In cognitive approach the binary distinction between *dictum* and *modus*/politeness would probably be considered "elegant" but misleading. Be it modality or politeness, however, cognitive approach is not necessary to assume that it is hard to find any advantage in quantitative research of sentences placed out of context.

Should the "polite" sentences be considered "marked," the ideal "unmarked" sentence, containing only the basic propositional meaning, could be described as representing information that "is always true" (Minsky 1975). For the examples 1. and 2. above the "always true" meaning would probably be deprived from honorific and modal "additions" and include only the element *dare* だれ 'who,' while for the examples 3., 4., and 5. it would be *shizukani* 静かに translated as 'quiet.' We get back here to the notion of the Japanese term *genpyōjitai* 言表自体, where *jitai* is written with the ideograms 自体 standing for 'the statement itself.' Also in Minsky's model, such meaning requires additional

information to form a message. It is in this sense that modality is described by Kiefer as:

> "[...] the relativization of the validity of sentence meanings to a set of possible worlds." (Kiefer 1994)

Still, there remains a definition of the set of possible worlds and a question whether the "pure meaning" can really be separated from the contextual requirements. While possible worlds may be countless, every tangible choice of a message parameter in an actual conversation narrows the range of uncertainty, not only about the speaker's attitude but also, and perhaps first of all, about what goals can be achieved by means of conversation viewed as of social behavior of concerned speakers.

One can describe honorifics on the basis of the the kind of speaker's attitude explained by Sugito (2004) with the use of the phrase: *Konna naiyō no koto, itte ii ka naa* こんな内容のこと、言っていいかなあ. 'Is this really suitable to say such a thing?' which is presented as a description of phenomena related to 敬意 *kei'i*, lit. 'respect,' 配慮 *hairyo*, 'consideration' or even 気ばり *kibari*, 'tension.' These factors inevitably affect both what is said and how it is said, not being restricted to the sole *modus*. It still remains unclear why and how such factors are related to grammatical and lexical oppositions. It is interesting that Sugito's paper starts with the following passage on a survey on honorifics:

> "The objective of the survey was first of all to collect participants' answers as utterances containing honorific forms. The question was: "A superior that you extremely respect is reading a book. How would you ask them what they were reading?" The National Institute for Japanese Language performs such surveys in the town of Okazaki in Aichi Prefecture periodically every 20 or 25 years since 1940s. There is a set of standard questions used from the beginning and the expected answers may contain various expressions of respect and politeness similar to: *Nani o oyomi desu ka?* 何をお読みですか or *Nani o yonde irassharu n deshō ka?* 'What are you reading?'.
> But there was a middle-aged man who thought very seriously over the answer. He was thinking quietly. Such surveys are performed according to a manual which prohibits the investigator to ask unnecessary questions and the change in the

question could affect the answer of the respondent. It is only permitted to ask considerately "What do you think?"[...] And then, finally, there came the answer. The respondent said: "You cannot ask such question a superior that you respect." (ibid.)

In order to explain why a Japanese question like *Nani o oyomi desu ka?* considered fairly neutral cannot be regarded "always true" and asked to "a superior that one respects" it is necessary to go beyond bare linguistic facts. It seems very promising to turn to the repertoire of situations and schema of context element interpretations considered typical in a given culture and setting. There is much more in the context of utterance than can be judged by examining only the attitude of the speaker, be it related to "respect" or not.

There is no doubt that from the purely theoretical and quantitative point of view it is "more polite" to ask partner's identity using the sentence 2. than 1. quoted above. At the same time, it is clear that when situational constraints enable the speaker to ask the question, there may be no need to make it "more polite." There are also many situations when it is virtually impossible to ask any question with the propositional content expressed in 1. and 2. And, quite apart from this, there seem to exist much more situations when one can ask someone's identity than, to give the simplest example, someone's age, as in the examples 6. in 7. below.

6. *Otoshi wa oikutsu desu ka.* お年はおいくつですか。('How old are you?')
7. *Otoshi wa oikutsu deshō ka.* お年はおいくつでしょうか。('May I ask how old you are?)

Both example 6. and 7. may hypothetically be assigned to a situation in which a bank clerk talks to a customer applying for a loan, but they are almost unthinkable in most of situations in which 1. or 2. may be considered valid. Note that, while it does not undermine the very concept of modal opposition existing between the forms *desu ka* and *deshō ka*, it becomes extremely inconvenient to explain the differences in their actual usage on the basis of sole notion of modality, for the very *dicta* to which these modal markers are applied do not seem to constitute a homogeneous collection of semantic instances that are "always true." A *dictum* considered "neutral" out of context may reveal very diverse constraints in actual speech situations. As Brown and Gilman (1960) put it:

"Not every personal attribute counts [...] However, extreme distinctive values on almost any dimension may become significant."

The notion of *dictum*, however it is defined, does not abolish contextual limitations. Theories based on binary notion of *dictum* opposed to modal or polite content of an utterance may explain how sentence contents are modified but the issue how they are used as communication tools in an actual environment is beyond their reach.

Layered Model and Procedures

As could be seen in the above examples, it is hard to deny *en bloc* the very existence of *dictum* and it is by no means my intention. A very similar distinction of informative and non-informative content of an utterance can be found in the description of honorific modification (HM) by Jabłoński (2003, 2004, 2005) on the basis of a layered model of communication. Since the range of HM is wider than that of modality and politeness, this distinction applies not to the opposition between "what is said" and "how it is said" but rather to the one between "what applies to the informative properties of the message" and "what validates a message in a communication environment." It is important to note that HM content of every message is two-fold: speech situation participants have to take into account both the "global" code vocabulary properties and the "local" message properties related to its functioning in the environment. Hence the opposition exists between protocol (surface modification) and procedure (context parameter management). The procedure content may not be directly manageable for the speaker in the way the protocol content is usually considered to be managed but it is the procedure modification that is primarily responsible for the adequacy of language behavior. It is in this sense that the protocol layer of the layered model of communication relies on the procedure layer. The adequacy of an utterance cannot be verified when procedure layer parameters are not defined.

In the examples 1. and 2. above, the protocol HM layer enables the speaker of Japanese to choose between such values as *dochira* (optionally equipped with suffix *–sama*) and *dare* and to decide whether the sentence style should be *desu/-masu* (polite). In the examples 3. through 5., the protocol layer is responsible for sentence style and for the use of benefactive constructions with *hoshii*, *kudasaru* (*kureru*) and *itadaku* (*morau*). One may call these oppositions "polite," but it should be remembered that "polite" or „modal" content is rather a result of speaker's decision on how

certain situational properties should be interpreted than a matter of an attitude. Similarly, the modal and polite value of a message is not to be regarded as "marked" or "unmarked" but rather as "regarded appropriate" or "inappropriate" in a given setting, quite apart from their quantity which may well equal zero. Since this choice influences the validity of a speech situation, it can hardly be considered "optional." The *dictum* is not neutral. Also the zero value of some parameters in an actual message requires speaker's decision. This constitutes a significant difference from the binary approach.

In Japanese communication environment many issues described traditionally as expressing the attitude of the speaker may be defined on the procedure level, due to recognition of certain fixed roles of situation participants. Such phenomena as vertical opposition between *senpai* 先輩 'senior' and *kōhai* 後輩 'junior' is important primarily not in terms of vocabulary and grammar but on the level of social behavior.

The decision on HM is made on the level of protocol but it originates from the procedure layer. The very term "procedure" is borrowed from Austin (1962) and applies to existing entities with certain preliminary conditions that have to be met and a number of steps to be executed properly and completely in order to reach certain effects. Procedures are sequences of behavior functioning as tools for achieving goals. They are linked to contextual parameters of communication environment and as such should be treated as units of communication activity regarded as an important part of social activity.

Variation in Quality – the Territory of Information

Kamio's (1997) theory of "the territory of information" constitutes a very good example of how procedural parameters of the environment can be related to utterance modification performed on the level of protocol. Kamio (ibid.: 13-15) presents an interaction between three persons: a company president P, his acquaintance Q (not from the same company) and the secretary R. R utters sentence 8. below to notify P on the meeting at 3PM. The same sentence, however, cannot be used by Q, who may only utter 9. or 10.

> 8. R : *Senmu, sanji kara kaigi de gozaimasu.* 専務、3 時から会議でございます。 ('[Boss,] you have a meeting at 3 o'clock.)

9. Q : *Senmu wa sanji kara kaigi ga aru yō desu ne.* 専務は 3 時から会議があるようですね。 ('[Boss,] you have a meeting at 3 o'clock, don't you?)
10. Q : *Senmu wa sanji kara kaigi ga arunjanai desu ka.* 専務は 3 時から会議があるんじゃないですか。 ('[Boss,] don't you have a meeting at 3 o'clock?') (ibid.)

Kamio describes the sentence 8. as "direct" and the 9. and 10. as "indirect." It is not the sentence surface, however, which is considered crucial. The "direct" or "indirect" form of a sentence may be chosen according to whether the relation between its informational content I and the speaker/hearer X may be defined as "I is related to X or not related to X" and whether "X may regard I as belonging to X or not belonging to X" (ibid.).

The notion of "territory" in the meaning used by Kamio may be considered universal but it should be noted that its impact differs across cultures. It is because the procedural constraints are different. In Poland, for example, the territorial relation of acquaintanceship between P and R could in many cases be valued more than the fact that R is not from the same company as P. A proper explanation of Kamio's "territory" for a Pole may require the introduction of a fourth person – a pizza delivery man – who is excluded from the interaction territory and may only use the "indirect" form, if any. Note that in Japanese environment such a person is not entitled to engage in the conversation even at the level of *dictum*. It is beyond the scope of this paper to determine whether there is no procedure in Japanese environment for a stranger to engage in an in-group conversation like the above or the Poles are simply more flexible than the Japanese when it comes to recognition of procedural restrictions.

Procedure constraints may more or less strictly prohibit some *dictum* variants in certain contexts. Japanese *imikotoba* 忌み言葉 ('taboo words') are one of the examples. It is for procedural reasons that a word like *rikon* 離婚 ('divorce') is not likely to appear in any context related to wedding ceremony, no matter how strong alethic negation is introduced. As can be seen, on the procedure level also the *dictum* content may be "marked." It is an important feature of Japanese communication competence to treat certain elements as far from being "always true". As one of exoteric sources on *imikotoba* in Japanese environment puts it:

„There is no need to be too nervous [about *imikotoba*] but it is better to get acquainted with them in advance, as a part of common sense." (Itō: 31)

Apart from the above mentioned rule prohibiting the appearence of words like *rikon* in speech situations related to wedding, probably the best examples of *imikotoba* provided by Itō for special consideration in contexts related to business environment would be *taoreru* 倒れる 'fall, collapse', *owaru* 終わる 'end' or *kubi ni naru* 'get fired.' According to Itō (ibid.) the use of these words should be avoided in official messages related to a referent's employment which may include congratulations on finding a new job. In such situations, the propositional content cannot be separated from the attitude of the speaker.

Analysis
Different languages reveal different modification techniques on the protocol level. This inevitably leads to gain or loss of information. The notion of territory functions as a very effective tool making it possible to explain the protocol modification of messages on the procedure level without referring directly to whether all speeaker's choices on the level of protocol can be rendered in a given language.

Suppose that the A(ction) of „getting to know H(earer)'s name" is the propositional core of sentences 1. and 2. provided by Miyake and belongs to the S(peaker)'s territory. The information in question belongs to H's territory. In order to ask H's name the S has to assume first that there is a procedure to demand the information belonging to H's territory that H can accept and that the procedure can be evoked in a given setting. The territorial meanings of sentences 1. and 2. can be described as follows:

1. – A is introduced as a question belonging purely to the S's territory. The information is literally demanded from H. This form can be regarded appropriate in some fixed situations, for example when S acts as H's vertical senior. The H's territory is then incorporated by S and H is obliged to provide the demanded information. There may exist other procedures when asking the H's name can be accepted. Should no valid procedure be recognized, H may interpret the utterance as invasive.

2. – A belongs to the S's territory but the *deshō ka* modification marks an important difference on the procedure level. The choice whether the information is provided for S or not is interpreted as belonging to the H's territory and autonomous. Vertical positions of S and H can be regarded equal or H's position may be interpreted as S's senior.

The above descriptions apply also, respectively, to the examples 6. and 7. above. For example, there is no need to make the utterance 6. "more polite" when a clerk and a customer applying for a loan recognize that the information on the latter's age is necessary to proceed with the interaction. For the reasons mentioned above, it is not adequate to treat such decision on the level of protocol as unilateral expression of speaker's attitude.

Should one consider the A(ction) of "the H(earer) being quiet" (belonging to H's territory) the propositional core of the messages 3. through 5. and should the S(peaker) assume that there is a procedure for A to be accepted by H, the territorial meanings of 3., 4. and 5. can be described as follows:

3. – A is introduced as a subject of direct wish belonging purely to the S's territory – this information exclusive to S, often not transferable to H who may ignore it. There is an overt opposition between what S wishes and what H does. 3. may be perfectly appropriate when procedural constraints (such as vertical dependence) incorporate the H's territory into the S's domain of influence. Should this condition not be fulfilled, the request 3., more than "inappropriate," will sound ridiculous. Note that it is not the attitude that is expressed here. A certain procedure negotiation that has to be performed in order for an interaction to happen. The same is true in the case of choice between 4. and 5., which is primarily territorial and procedural and only secondarily related to politeness and protocol:

4. – A is requested as a favor done explicitly by H (this is marked by the choice of auxiliary benefactive verb *kudasaru* with H as its subject) to S. Although the procedure of asking favor effectively reduces the opposition between S's wishes and H's actions, S may lack procedural rights to evoke it.

5 – A is linked to a potential favor done by H to S with the emphasis on the non-invasive possibility of receiving it (marked by the auxiliary benefactive verb *morau* in its potential and interrogative form, with S as subject) – the H's territory is hardly mentioned explicitly (the decision whether H takes A belonging to H's territory is utterly on H's part).

There is one more reason to state that it is the situational parameters that primarily influence the way messages are generated and exchanged in a human communication oriented environment. Let us go back to the Miyake's sentences 3., 4. and 5. and examine whether one can equip them with even more modality and politeness. The results are as presented in the examples 11. and 12. below.

11. *Shizuka ni shite itadakemasen ka*. 静かにしていただけま
せんか。('Could I humbly receive a favor of you being
quiet?')
12. *Shizuka ni shite itadakemasen deshō ka*. 静かにしていた
だけませんでしょうか。('Would it be possible that I could
humbly receive a favor of you being quiet?')

Utterances 11. and 12. have been derived from utterance 5. but the
suppletive humble form *itadaku* of the auxiliary benefactive verb *morau* in
its polite, potential and interrogatory negative form *itadakemasenka* was
used in sentence 11. in order to make it sound more sophisticated. The
difference between the sentences 11. and 12 is exactly the same as between
1. and 2. – some modality was "added". Sentence 12. is hence recognized
as more elaborate and polite than sentence 11, since there is more modality
in it. These sentences may again be compared against 3., 4. and 5. and the
obvious conclusion may be that the more elaborate the modal content of a
sentence, the more polite it gets. It can even be argued that the very length
of a sentence in Japanese influences directly its politeness in a simple and
effective way.

There are numerous arguments to support such view and only one that
makes this dispute utterly futile. The description of the *itadaku* form as
more polite than *morau* in purely binary terms emerges from the fact that
its humble benefactive meaning (emphasizing the fact that the subject of
benefactive auxiliary verb is a beneficiary of the subject of main verb) is
combined with humble honorific meaning (emphasizing a vertical distance
between the subject of benefactive auxiliary verb and the subject of main
verb). In purely mathematical terms it all adds up: the sentence is more
elaborate. Within the inventory of protocol layer which enables a fluent
speaker of Japanese to choose a "modal" *darō ka/deshō ka* element it is
possible to increase the level of sentence politeness with a pinch of
modality. On the other hand, since *itadaku* is reserved for vertical seniors,
procedure layer requirements will either force S to interpret the distance in
vertical position between S and H as shorter – and not use *itadaku* – or not
permit S to invade the territory of H, once H's vertical position as a vertical
senior is approved. It is very doubtful that sentences like 11. and 12. will
appear in an actual conversation. It is more likely that S will say nothing
and endure than demand the A of "H being quiet." Otherwise, there is a
danger that the situation will evolve into unpredictable and this is surely
not how the individuals interacting in Japanese communication
environment tend to change the "situational properties" of interaction.

Conclusion

The contepts of *dictum* and "the most clear, unambiguous and concise way possible" in which things are said are intrinsically quantitative criteria of linguistic research. While there is no reason to restrict the free choice of research methodology, it should be explained what is lost due to the binary approach to linguistic facts.

Although the binary notions may serve as convenient generalizations of certain oppositions between linguistic data in question, they do not explain how actual utterances are used as communication tools in a thoroughly defined human communication environment. The concept of attitude cannot serve as a useful tool for utterance analysis, for it is separated from the contextual constraints of human communication.

Brown and Levinson (ibid.) built their theory of politeness on the notion of face borrowed from Goffman and others (1967). It should be noted that for Goffman it was not the face which was considered most important but the definition of a situation projected by its participants. This is how sociology solved the dilemma between speaker's individual actions and the need to satisfy the requirements of the outside world. In the approach of human linguistics postulated by Yngve (ibid.) the situational properties of the interaction participants are of dynamic character and can be interpreted as tangible results of certain social behavior.

It is the parameters of a speech situation that primarily influence the modification of utterance elements, not the face or attitude. In the actual communication environment it is possible, to say the least, that the actions are utterly different from the attitude. Still, they have to fit a certain procedure frame recognized by the participants. It is in this important sense that it is not enough to be polite or use sophisticated modal forms in order to communicate effectively.

Where no definition of situation is provided, not much can be explained. In terms of the layered model of communication both modality and politeness depend on protocol, procedure and context. In an actual communication environment the propositional core of an utterance is always verified against context, often before the actual communication can be initiated. It takes a considerable effort to analyze procedure parameters, make protocol decisions, communicate and achieve conversational goals. Speech activity inevitably influences the external world including both the hearer's verbal behavior and the actual results of communication activity in question. There are more similarities than differences between politeness and modality in this aspect.

References

Austin, John Langshaw. 1962, *How to do Things With Words*, Cambridge, Massachusets: Harvard University Press.

Bańczerowski, Jerzy, Jerzy Pogonowski, Tadeusz Zgółka. 1982. *Wstęp do językoznawstwa* (introduction to linguistics). Poznań: Uniwersystet im. Adama Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.

Brown, Pelelope, Stephen Levinson. 1978. "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena" [in:] Esther N. Goody [ed.] *Questions and Politeness. Strategies in Social Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 74-324.

Brown, Roger W., Albert Gilman. 1960. "The Pronouns of Power and Solidarity" [in:] Sebeok, T. [ed.] *Style and Language.* Boston: MIT Press, 253-276.

Geis, Michael, E. 1995. *Speech Acts and Conversational Interaction.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face to Face behavior.* Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Ito Jun'ichi [no marking of publication year]. *Bijinesu bunsho no tsukurikata* (creating business documents). Tōkyō: Nagaoka Shoten.

Jabłoński, Arkadiusz. 2003. „Procedure and Protocol. Japanese Honorifics in a Layered Model of Communication." *Linguistic and Oriental Studies from Poznań* 5, 151-171.

   2004. „Honorific Modification (HM). The Informative and the Non-informative Part of the Message." *Silva Iaponicarum* 1: 7-25, www.silvajp.amu.edu.pl/Silva%201.pdf.

   2005. „Taigū jōhō to komyunikeeshon kaisō moderu" (honorific modification and the layered model of communication) *Tōkyō daigaku gengogaku ronbunshū* 24, 59-77.

Kamio, Akio. 1997. *Territory of Information.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1994. "Modality." [in:] R. E. Asher [ed.], *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 2515-2520.

Kikuchi Yasuto. 1997. *Keigo* (honorifics). Tōkyō: Kōdansha.

Minsky, Marvin. 1975. "A Framework for Representing Knowledge" [in:] Peter Winston [ed.] *The Psychology of Computer Vision*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 211-277.

Miyake Tomohiro. 1999. "Modariti to poraitonesu" (modality and politeness). *Gengo* 6 (28) 64-69.

Mizutani Osamu. 1993. *Keigo kyōiku no kihon mondai* (basic problems of teaching honorifics). Vol. 2., Tōkyō: Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyūjo.

Nitta Yoshio. 1991. *Nihongo no modariti to ninshō* (modality and person in Japanese). Kasukabe: Hitsuji Shobō.

Sugito Seiju. 2004. *Kei'i hyōgen kōdō ni tsuite no kihan ishiki o megutte* (on the standard evaluation of behavior related to expressing respect). *Taigū komyunikēshon* 2, 66-80.

Wierzbicka, Anna. 1999. "Prototypy i inwarianty" (Prototypes and Invariants). [in:] Anna Wierzbicka. *Język – umysł – kultura* (language – mind – culture). Transl. Krzysztof Korżyk. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN SA, 27-48. Originally published as: "'Prototypes save': on the Uses and Abuses of the Notion of 'Prototype' in Linguistics and Related Fields. [in:] *Meanings and Prototypes. Studies in Linguistic Categorization.* [ed.] S. L. Tsohatzidis. London – New York: Routledge, 347-369.

Wlodarczyk, André. 1996 *Politesse et personne.* (politeness and person) Paris: Editions L'Harmattan.

Yngve, Victor H. 1975. "Human Linguistics and Face-to-Face Interaction". [in:] Adam Kendon, Richard M. Harris, Mary Ritchie Key [eds.] *Organization of Behavior in Face-to-Face Interaction.* The Hague, Paris: Mouton Publishers, 47-62.

ヤロスワフ・ピエトロフ

性という文法範疇と日本語における助数詞システム——普遍的な文法の分類範疇か？

はじめに

本研究の目的は、性という文法範疇と日本語における助数詞のシステムとの文法的・意味論的・体系的な共通点または類似点を分析・記述することである。これらの文法的システムは先行研究では別の言語的な現象として捉えられる傾向にあるが、本研究では双方とも分類という同じ文法範疇をなし、その範疇の文法的な表示を生成しているという仮説を立てる。

1.　先行研究

性の範疇をめぐる研究には、長い歴史がある。その現象に初めて注目し、文法的記述を行ったのはプロタゴラス（Protagoras）という五世紀の古代ギリシャ哲学者である。彼は当時のギリシャ語で三つの性を区別して、それぞれを男性・女性・物性と呼んだ。その後、アリストテレス（Aristoteles）はものを表すギリシャ語の語彙もまた男性あるいは女性として定まった語尾を持つことを観察した結果、プロタゴラスの術語の「物性」を「中性」に変えた。中世時代のヨーロッパの言語研究者たちもほとんど同じ考え方に依拠し、それぞれの自国語において文法〈性〉による名詞の分類を行った。文法範疇について興味深い見解を提示したのは、十九世紀ドイツの言語学者ヴィルヘルム・ヴント（Wilhelm Wundt）である。彼によれば、文法〈性〉に従って人間が周囲の世界のものと現象をどのように分け、それぞれの世界の要素に対してどのような価値判断を行うかが反映される。個々の言語によって価値判断の基準も異なる。ヴントは五つのタイプを区別した。第一のタイプは神、男／女、子ども、もの、第二は神、人間／もの、第三は有生／無生、第四は男性／女性、第五は性と交差をしている文法範疇とそうでないものである。日本語や他の東アジア言語における助数詞に基づくシステムについては研究の歴史も短く、ヨーロッパにおける文法〈性〉の研究ほど進んでいなかった。Classificator　（助数詞）という術語を導入したのは、二十世紀のイギリス言語学者のジョン・ライオンズ（John

Lyons）である。第二次世界大戦後、特に中国語における助数詞システムが世界の言語学者の興味を引き、その現象をめぐって多くの論文が現れた。その中では、Maurice Coyaud の「Classification Nominale en Chinois」が大きな影響を与えた。しかし、その論文は形態的な側面のみを取り上げ、意味論的には一切触れていない。また、他の言語現象（そのうち、性の文法範疇）と比較することもなく、簡略な記述を行うにとどまっている。また、昨年、名詞とそれに使う助数詞のリストが載っていて、助数詞の知恵の財宝と言える『数え方の辞典』という本がされたが、依然としてその助数詞と名詞の分類の意味論的な記述が欠けている。

私が行おうとしている意味論的、比較的な性と助数詞システムの研究方法は、十年前にはまだ珍しかったが近年少しずつ変わりつつある。この点で、Pamela Downing の「Numeral Classifier Systems. The Case of Japanese」という研究書が重要であろう。著者は類型論的に異なる言語の比較を背景に、日本語の助数詞システムを詳細に分析している。また、記述の基準を、形態論でなく、言語に反映されている母語者の周りの世界の見方とその世界の現象の分類を中心とする意味論に置いている。そして助数詞の細かいリストも添えて、わずかだが日本の歴史的な分類システムにも言及している。

2. 文法範疇とは何か

John Lyons の定義を引用するならば、文法範疇という術語は「特定言語の記述に認められる任意の要素群を指すために用いられる」。その区別の基準としては、ほとんどの場合形態論的基準が採用され、語活用のパラダイムによって決まる。すでに古代ギリシャの哲学者によって区別されていた文法範疇のなかでは、たとえば名詞の格（主格、対格など）、数（単数、複数）、性（男性、女性、中性）、時制（現在、過去、未来）、人称（一人称、二人称、三人称）がその例である。現代の言語におけるあらゆる範疇を厳密に数えあげることはむろん不可能だが、世界の全言語を比較すると、ある種の範疇は驚くほど頻繁に観察される。その例が、すでに述べた名詞の格、時制、人称である。また、文法範疇の種類は固定的に決まったものではないということも強調したい。特定言語の語彙と活用パラダイムの分析の仕方によって、種々さまざまな範疇が摘出され得るのである。

3. 性という伝統的な文法範疇
次に、性はなぜ固有の文法範疇として扱われるかという問題について少し述べたい。

3.1. 文法〈性〉のさまざま
インド・ヨーロッパ言語の大部分では、名詞に文法的な関係をなしている動詞、形容詞、代名詞、数詞はその名詞（の形）によって違う形をとる。以下にポーランド語の例を挙げる。

telefon　　　　（電話、電話機：男性名詞）
lampa　　　　（電灯、ランプ：女性名詞）
okno　　　　　（窓：中性名詞）

この語に修飾語として形容詞をつける際には、名詞によって形容詞の適当な形を選び〈性〉を一致させる必要がある。

→　　　nowy telefon　　（新しい電話機）
→　　　nowa lampa　　（新しい電灯）
→　　　nowe okno　　　（新しい窓）

動詞、代名詞、数詞と結びつく際にも、類似の現象が観察される（次例における、英語の to be に当たる連辞 być は、動詞の役割を果たしている）。

→　　　Telefon był nowy.　　（電話は新しかった。）
→　　　Lampa była nowa.　　（ランプは新しかった。）
→　　　Okno było nowe.　　（窓は新しかった。）

→　　　ten telefon　　（この電話）
→　　　ta lampa　　（このランプ）
→　　　to okno　　（この窓）

→　　　jeden telefon　　（一台の電話）
→　　　jedna lampa　　（一台のランプ）
→　　　jedno okno　　（一枚の窓）

33

断るまでもなく、このような現象はポーランド語に限って現れるのではない。しかし、スラブ語族に属する諸言語では西ヨーロッパの言語におけるよりも、広く観察される。たとえばフランス語やイタリア語やドイツ語では、もはや名詞と動詞の一致は行われていない。また、言語によって名詞のグループすなわち性の種類も違う。ポーランド語、チェコ語、ドイツ語などの三つの性（男性、女性、中性）に対して、フランス語、イタリア語、ポルトガル語などで、現在は二つの性しかない（男性、女性）。しかしながら、現象そのものは同一だといえるだろう。ここで、現代英語ではそのような区別はもうなく消滅していることを付言しておく必要がある。英語では、人称代名詞を使う際にのみ〈性〉情報が必要になる（これは大部分の言語に見られる普遍的な現象でありと見なしてよい）。しかし、人称代名詞が示すその性は指示されるものの純粋に生物的な性なので、意味論的な現象と言える（もと女性名詞だった船や国に対して用いられる女性指示代名詞 she はその例外である）。

3.2.　伝統的な記述方法

性の現象の伝統的な記述は、形態論的な観察に限られていた。語の形と語尾変化の分析を通して名詞グループの種類が発見された。グループの名前（男性名詞、女性名詞）は各グループに属する人間を表す名詞が性によって異なり、一つのグループでは男の人を表し、もう一つのグループでは女の人を表すという観察の結果としてつけられたものである。また、それ以外のグループに人間を表す名詞がほとんどなく、代わりものを表す語が圧倒的に多かったので、そのグループは物性（中性）と呼ばれた。しかし、格のグループが人間を表す名詞でなく、普通の名詞（もの、自然現象など）すなわち性に無関係な名詞のみから成るため、この文法範疇は生物の性に関係がなく恣意的に決定されたことが古代ギリシャの哲学者たちによって証明された。一般にこの範疇は、形態論以外の観点から記述され得ないと考えられてきたのである。

3.3. 意味論的な記述の試み

次のような語のペアを例にして、考えてみよう。

男性名詞			女性名詞	
król	（男の王様）	／	królowa	（女王）
student	（男の学生）	／	studentka	（女の学生）
kot	（オスの猫）	／	kotka	（メスの猫）
koń	（オスの馬）	／	klacz	（メスの馬）
byk	（オスの牛）	／	krowa	（メスの牛）
jeleń	（オスの鹿）	／	łania	（メスの鹿）

人間または人間の環境に住み人間の生活上重要な役割を果たす動物を表すのに用いられる名詞の圧倒的多数は、これらの例のようなペアを成す。その現象は普遍的で、性の文法範疇が存在するすべての各言語に観察される。なぜこのようになったのかという自然な疑問が頭に浮かぶ。

人類学の立場からすれば、性という範疇は人間が自分で住んでいる世界に関する知識とその世界に対する価値判断を鏡のように映している。すなわち、生物本来の性とこれまで指摘されてきた以上に強い関係があるといえる。

歴史的に早い段階で生成したインド・ヨーロッパ部族では、周辺に住み着いた敵の部族から自らを守る武士階級が自然に現れてきたと考えられている。その階級の重要性がだんだん強くなり、次の発展段階ではその指導者が王や将軍などの重大な役割を担うようになった。古代社会では高位の存在に対しては特別に大きな尊敬を表さなければなかったため、その思いが彼らの言語にも強い影響を及ぼしたらしい。尊敬すべき人、すなわち社会の最高位の存在はほとんど男性だったので男性を表す語をそうでない語から区別する必要が生じた（男性名詞／非男性名詞の区別）。さらには、社会であまり重要な役割を演じていない人間（子ども、未成年者、未婚の女）をも区別して、別の方法でその人たちに関する言語情報を伝えるようになった（非男性名詞／その他名詞）。非男性名詞は現在の女性名詞という術語に当たり、その他の名詞は現在の中性名詞のグループを成す。その現象は現代ドイツ語やポーランド語に残っている。

ドイツ語	ポーランド語	
ドイツ語	**ポーランド語**	
das Fräulein	dziewczę	（娘、未婚の若い女性：中性名詞）
das Kind	dziecko	（子ども：中性名詞）

ここで興味深いのは、性の範疇を持っているあらゆる言語（強調しておきたいが、例外は一つもない）において神様を表す語が必ず男性名詞だということである。ここから、言語的〈性〉によって特定の民族がどのように世界を見ているか、その世界で何を重要視しているか、その世界をどのように判断しているか、などが明らかになる。つまり、性の範疇には人間が世界をどのように分割しているかという知識が反映しているのである。

しかしながら、すべての語彙を分析すると、性にまったく関係ないものを表す語も簡単に見つかる。その例としては、３．１．に挙げた語群でもよい。なぜその語がそれぞれ違うグループに属するのか。答えは性の範疇が生成された最終段階で人間および人間と親しい動物以外のものを表すすべての名詞が文法化され、それが帯びている形（語尾）の類似性に基づいて三グループに分けられてしまったからである。ポーランド語の場合、女性名詞のもともとのグループを成した語がほとんど a で終わっていたので、lampa という語も女性名詞として扱われるようになった。中性名詞の語尾は o だったので、okno という語も然るべく中性名詞に振り分けられた。ポーランド語ではもともと男性名詞は子音で終わったので、telefon も男性名詞となった。

また、各言語は性のグループを表す一定の語尾を持つ。これが、言語によって同じものまたは現象を表す語が異なる文法〈性〉を持つ理由だと思われる。次の例が示すようにリンゴという簡単な語は、音声的には類似しているにせよどの言語でも同じ文法〈性〉を持ちはしないということである。

ポーランド語 POL jabłko（-o の語尾：中性名詞）
チェコ語 CZE jablko（-o の語尾：中性名詞）
ロシア語 RUS jabloko [яблоко]（-o の語尾：中性名詞）
セルビア語 SER jabuka [jaбyka]（-a の語尾：女性名詞）
オランダ語 NED appel（子音：男性名詞）
ドイツ語 GER Apfel（子音：男性名詞）

デンマーク語 DEN　　aeble　　（中性名詞）
ノルウェー語 NOR (bokmål) eple（中性名詞）
ギリシャ語 GRE mēlo [μήλο]　　（中性名詞）
ラテン語 LAT　malus（子音：中性名詞）
イタリア語 ITA mela　　（-a の語尾：女性名詞）
ルーマニア語 ROM măr（子音：中性名詞）
フランス語 FRA pomme（-e の語尾：女性名詞）
スペイン語 ESP manzana（-a の語尾：女性名詞）
ポルトガル語 POR maçã（-a の語尾：女性名詞）

3.4.　　文法〈性〉の機能

文法〈性〉の第一の機能は名詞がどのグループに属するかという情報を示すことにあると言われている。主語が文に現れていなくても主語の所属がすぐにわかるのである。たとえば：

Już przyszedł.　　もう来ている。
（出てない主語は必ず男性名詞：男、彼、父、男の学生など）
Już przysz**a**.　　もう来ている。
（出てない主語は必ず女性名詞：女、彼女、母、女の学生など）
Już przysz**o**.　　もう来ている。
（出てない主語は必ず中性名詞：子ども、赤ちゃん、未婚の女性）

しかし、それだけではない。ある言語では文法〈性〉が外来語起源を示すことができる（日本語ではカタカナなどがそういう機能を果たす）。よく引用されるのはロシア語の例である。ロシア語の中性名詞のうち、単数が o で終わる語には、まったく曲用しない名詞がある。その語はいずれも、他の言語（特にラテン語）から借用された外来語である（ロシア語の一般の中性名詞はむろん曲用する）。

格	一般の中性名詞	外来語の中性名詞		
主格	окн**о**（窓が）	вино（ワインが）	кино（映画館）	Токио（東京）
生格	окн**а**（窓の）	вино（ワインの）	кино	Токио
与格	окн**у**（窓に）	вино（ワインに）	кино	Токио
対格	окн**о**（窓を）	вино（ワインを）	кино	Токио
造格	окн**ом**（窓で）	вино（ワインで）	кино	Токио
前置格	окн**е**（窓に）	вино（ワインに）	кино	Токио

ポーランド語において同様のグループを成すのは、um 語尾で終わる中性名詞（ラテン語からの借用語）である（muzeum　「博物館」, planetarium　「プラネタリウム」, laboratorium　「実験室」, sanktuarium　「聖堂、サンクチュアリ」など）。

3.5.　数と性の交差
ここまで論じてきたのは、単数名詞における文法〈性〉の分割である。しかしながら、周知のようにインド・ヨーロッパの諸言語には数という範疇も存在し、性の範疇と交差している。たとえば、ポーランド語の単数名詞が三つの性（男性、女性、中性）グループに分けられるのに対して、複数形は二つのグループのいずれかに属する。それは男性人間性（人間であり、男性であるということ）と非男性人間性の二グループである。この区別の基準は人の男性を表す名詞／そのほかの名詞という人間中心的な区別である。文法〈性〉を持つ他のインド・ヨーロッパの言語でも同じような特徴がみられる。

名詞	単数名詞としての性	複数名詞としての性
student　「男の学生」	男性	男性人間性
kot　「猫」		非男性人間性
komputer「コンピューター」		
studentka　「女の学生」	女性	
lampa　「ランプ」		
dziecko　「子ども」	中性	
okno　「窓」		

表1．ポーランド語における単数名詞と複数名詞の文法〈性〉の関係。

例：

Przyszedł now**y** student.
新しい（一人の）男の学生が
やってきた。

Przyszedł now**y** kot.
新しい一匹の猫が
やってきた。

Przyszł**a** now**a** studentka.
新しい（一人の）女の学生が
やってきた。

Przyszł**o** now**e** dziecko.
新しい（一人の）子どもが
やってきた。

Przyszl**i** now**i** studenci.
新しい男の学生たちが
やってきた。

Przyszł**y** now**e** koty.
新しい（数匹の）猫が
やってきた。

Przyszł**y** now**e** studentki.
新しい女の学生たちが
やってきた。

Przyszł**y** now**e** dzieci.
新しい子どもたちが
やってきた。

この現象を分析すると、性という文法範疇で見られる世界の区別は
純粋に人間中心（厳密に言えば男性人間中心）の区分だと結論でき
る。

4.　日本語の文法的分類システムとの類似点
ここで日本語の助数詞システムとその形態論的または意味論的な特
徴を紹介する。上記文法〈性〉と比較しつつ、その類似点を提示し
たい。

4.1.　　形態論の面の類似点
ヨーロッパの諸言語のように、日本語でも名詞によってその名詞と
文法的に関係するある品詞の形も変わる。その品詞とは、動詞や形
容詞ではなくて数詞である。日本語の場合、名詞がどのグループに
属するかという情報はものを数える際にのみ必要になるが、形態論
の面から見られた現象としては、れ自体は類似しているのではない
だか。以下に例を挙げよう。

鉛筆、傘、紐、フィルムなど	一本	二本	三本
椅子、机、肘掛、ベッドなど	一脚	二脚	三脚
自動車、コンピューター、ケーキなど	一台	二台	三台
馬、象、ワニ、トカゲなど	一頭	二頭	三頭
竿、箪笥、幟（のぼり）など	一竿	二竿	三竿

袴（はかま）、太刀（たち）など　　　　　　　一腰　二腰　三腰
などなど

このように見ると、日本語の数詞はまるで活用のようなパラダイム
を成すことがわかる（日本語の名詞の格パラダイムを参照のこと──猫が、
猫に、猫を、猫で、猫から、猫のなど）。ヨーロッパ諸言語のように名
詞によって己れの形を変えるのである。日本語でも名詞はグループ
分けされていることになるが、ここでグループの種類は驚くほど多
く、３００を超える。
日本語における類別詞の性質や機能を調べるには、さまざまさまざ
まな分析方法があり、その中には抽象度パラメータの仮説が特に有
効であると思われる。その仮説によれば、抽象度パラメータの低い
言語では類別詞が発達するが、一方抽象度パラメータの高い言語で
は個数詞が発達する。Fujii （藤井）の分析によれば、日本語のいわ
ゆる「破壊動詞」の分類と類別詞の分類の間には、相関関係が見ら
れる。

動詞	名詞	類別詞
割る	鏡	枚
	氷	枚
	花瓶	個
折る	棒	本
	鉛筆	本
切る	糸	本
	針金	破る
破る	紙	枚
	服	着・枚
壊す	機械	台
	車	台
	時計	個
	椅子	個・脚
崩す	積み木	山

日本語における類別詞体系は、さまざまなさまざま側面からの分析
が可能である。ものの数え方としてよりはむしろ数量的分析に基づ

く範疇化の手段として考えるならば、類別詞体系の多次元的な「形態」論を提案できるかもしれない。以下の名詞に対応する類別詞を比較すると、こうした多次元的・数量的な観点が存在するのがわかるだろう。

名詞　数量詞

薬　　錠（じょう）　　錠剤やカプセルの形
　　　カプセル　　　　カプセルの形
　　　包（ほう）　　　紙に包んだ形
　　　丸（がん）　　　丸く、小さな錠剤の形
　　　本（ほん）　　　薬になる液体を含む注射器の形
時計　台（だい）　　　掛け時計の場合
　　　本（ほん）　　　腕時計の場合
　　　個（こ）　　　　目覚まし時計の場合
　　　面（めん）　　　日時計の場合
蝋燭　本（ほん）　　　細長い形のもの
　　　挺（ちょう）　　燭台に乗せたもの
　　　個（こ）　　　　丸く平たいもの（細長くない形）
道　　本（ほん）　　　普通人間が歩く道
　　　筋（すじ）　　　獣道
　　　条（じょう）　　地図や設計図で見た直角で交差する形

4.2.　　意味論上の類似点

意味論的な記述は、より興味深く貴重な情報を与える。各グループの内容を比べると、日本語の名詞はたった一つのグループに属するわけではないことが明らかになる。同じ名詞が複数のグループに属することもある。また、グループは重複する場合もある。名詞グループを詳細に分析してみると、グループは意味論的な階層（ハイアラーキー）を持っていることがわかる。次の表は、一番広い範囲のあるグループから順に、次第に細かく、極めて狭い意味を持つグループに至るまでの階層を示している。

意味論上の階級	名詞のグループ													
	人間（人）			小さくて、特に人間と親しい動物（匹）	大きくて、危険な動物、虫の一部（頭）	鳥、ウサギ（羽）	魚、海の動物（尾）	もの（つ）						
	参加者数（名）	敬語（氏）	普通（人）					細長いもの（本）	電気のもの（台）			飛行機（一機）	二次元的なもの（一枚）	他のもの（個）
									電灯（灯）	重い機械（基）	その他（台）			

表２．日本語の名詞グループの意味論的な階級の例（括弧はそのグループを表示する助数詞）

ここに紹介したグループの構造は限られた例にすぎず、むろん網羅からはほど遠いが、ものの分類の仕方と人間の考え方をはっきりと示している。注目すべきは、一番上の最も基本的なものの区別である。これは人間／動物の種類／生きていないものという人間にとって重要な区別を表している。文法〈性〉と同じようにこちらでも人類中心という態度が見られる。しかし、日本人にとっては生物の性よりも、有生／無生、ものの形、利用性といった分類が重要な役割を果たしていたのだろう（今日では、日本語使用者がどの助数詞を選択するかにその者の言語能力と知識が反映されるという側面もある。たとえば、現在はもうあまり使われていない簓というものをどんな助数詞を使って数えたらよいものかと、ほとんどの人は頭をひね。唯一の正確な答えは「腰」である）。
以上紹介してきた数えることに基づく世界のものの分類システムは、日本語に限らず、周知のように、他の東アジア諸言語でも複雑に形

成されてきた。しかし、このシステムの概念と仕組みが同じであってもものグループの基準は各言語で異なる。たとえば、韓国語の助数詞システムでは、動物が一つのグループを成して（その中では、まったく区別を行わない）、同じ一語（마리）で表示する。中国語では、数詞だけでなく指示代名詞も関係がある名詞のグループによって一定の形を取るらしい。また、ベトナム語では、すべての名詞がどのグループに所属するかを示す形態素を伴う。

これは、言語学者が記述する表層構造と深層構造の明白な例であると考えられる。深層構造には人間中心主義にに基づく世界分類の概念があるが、その概念が表層構造においては各言語に特徴的な形をとり、文法的システムを構成するのである。

5. 他の分類システム － スワヒリ語の例

ここで、ものの興味深い文法的分類システムの一例として、スワヒリ語を紹介する価値があるかもしれない。スワヒリ語では、名詞は六つの主要グループに分けられる。グループによって、名詞そのものや名詞に文法的に関係するすべての品詞が然るべき接頭辞を受ける。たとえば、次のようにである。

	名詞の例 （単数・複数）		名詞のグループの 接頭辞		意味
	[太字は名詞の形態素を表す]				
1.	m**tu**	wa**tu**	m-	wa-	人間
2.	ki**su**	vi**su**	ki-	vi-	ナイフ
3.	m**ti**	mi**ti**	m-	mi-	木
4.	n**chi**	n**chi**	n-	n-	国
5.	ji**we**	ma**we**	ji-	ma-	石
6.	u**devu**	n**devu**	u-	n-	毛

例文 （太字は名詞のグループの接頭辞を表す）：

名詞＋動詞

Mtu **a**mefika.	一人の人がやってきた。
Watu **wa**mefika.	人たちがやってきた。
Kisu **ki**meanguka.	一本のナイフが落ちた。

Visu **vi**meanguka.	数本のナイフが落ちた。
Mti **u**mekauka.	一本の木が枯れた。
Miti **i**mekauka.	数本の木が枯れた。

名詞＋形容詞＋指示代名詞

mtu **m**zuri **yu**le.	この美しい一人の人
watu **wa**zuri **wa**le.	この美しい人たち
miti **m**zuri **u**le.	この美しい一本の木
miti **mi**zuri **i**le.	この美しい数本の木

スワヒリ語の分類システムは、ヨーロッパ言語学の強い影響下で、「文法〈性〉の範疇」と呼ばれるようになった。興味深いのは、ヨーロッパの諸言語と違って、このシステムのもとになっているのは生物の自然性でなく、唯一ものの形態や使用価値という別な判断基準だということである。また、意味論的な立場からは、スワヒリ語のシステムは日本語の分類システムとよく似ているともいえるだろう。

6．まとめ

以上、さまざまな分類システムを分析してきた結果として、インド・ヨーロッパの諸言語における文法〈性〉と東アジアの言語の分類システム、さらには西アフリカのスワヒリ語における分類システムとは、意味論的に類似した根拠に基づいて形成されたものであることが明らかになる。これらすべてのシステムは、深層構造では人間の世界や社会に対する認知や価値判断に基づいた世界の分類の仕方を成すが、表層構造では多様な形態をとり、多様な形態的・統語論的な関係に入る。この現象に対して、本論で紹介した意味論的記述を行うと、どのシステムも、同様の（一般言語学で使われる用語を引用すると）普遍的文法範疇を構成していると結論される。この普遍的な文法範疇を、仮に「分類範疇」と名づけることにしよう。次表はこのように把握された範疇と今まで記述に用いられてきた伝統的な範疇との関係を示している。

深層構造 （仮名）	人間中心主義に基づ 「分類範疇」							
分類の最も根底的な基準	生物的な性、 社会的な身分				ものの形や使用価値			
伝統的な名前	文法〈性〉の範疇			生物の性の範疇	文法〈性〉の範疇	助数詞システム		
表層構造 （形態的な特徴）	単数名詞の二つの性	単数名詞の三つの性 動詞に現れる	単数名詞の三つの性 動詞に現れない	指示代名詞に性が現れる（名詞の性）の区別しない	すべての品詞に現れる	数詞のみに現れる	数詞と指示代名詞に現れる	数詞、指示名詞、名詞そのものに現れる
例	FRA ITA ESP	POL CZE RUS UKR GRE LAT	ROM GER	ENG	SWA	JPN KOR	CHN	VIE

表３．本論で導入された分類範疇と伝統的な分類範疇の関係。

参考文献

高橋太郎ほか、２００３．「日本語の文法。講義テキスト」、千葉：正文社。

飯田朝子、町田健、２００４．「数え方の辞典」、東京：小学館。

Coyaud, Maurice 1973. *Classification nominale en Chinois*. Paris – La Haye: Mouton&Co.

Downing, Pamela. *Numeral Classifier Sysytems. The Case of Japanese.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Fujii Yoko 2000. "The story of "break": cognitive categories of objects and the system of verbs". *Cultural, Psychological and Typological Issues in Cognitive Linguistics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lyons, John 1968. *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. （日本語版：１９７３．「理論言語学」、東京：大修館書店）

STRESZCZENIA / SUMMARIES / 要約

Arkadiusz Jabłoński

Modality, Honorifics, Meaning

While modality is recognized as expressing speaker's attitude, honorifics are described with reference to social norms. Both modal and honorific content of an utterance may be perceived as distinct from its propositional core. Kikuchi and Mizutani overtly separate the actual meaning of an utterance from its honorific content. Mizutani describes Japanese honorifics in terms of proposition and modality.

The answers to the following questions will be attempted in my theoretically oriented paper:

1. What are contextual limitations of modality and honorifics?
2. Is the honorific and modal meaning of an utterance marked?
3. To what extent may the speaker's behavior related to modal of honorific modification be considered free?
4. Are there common grounds for modality and honorifics description?

My suggestion is neither to treat honorifics as modality nor modality as honorifics. It is rather meant to point at the low-level context parameters which are crucial for both phenomena. I would especially like to focus on Kamio's notion of territory of information which is deeply rooted in the context parameters although it does not address directly the modality or honorifics. Most definitions found in dictionaries define modality as "expressing attitude." On the other hand, a brief summary of Kamio's approach would probably be that it is not enough to assume that something is/may be/must be true to express it; it is necessary to have sufficient rights to the piece of information.

The speaker's choice of a modal or honorific form is based on what situation is recognized in a given environment. It is also in this sense that modality can be defined as similar to projecting a definition of the situation mentioned by Goffman. On this level of abstraction the distinction between the semantic character of modality and the pragmatic character of politeness no longer obscures the relation of both.

Jarosław Pietrow

The Grammatical Category of Gender and the Japanese Classifier System. The Problem of Universal Grammar of Categorization

The present study is aimed at comparison of basic properties of grammatical and natural gender (of the Indo-European type) and so-called classifier system of the Japanese type. The latter type of linguistic categorization is further confronted with some parallel phenomena seen in Suahili and in East-Asian languages. It can be seen that on the most general level of language typology, there are universal criteria of object classification which are reflected in both category of gender and classifier system. The former is based on natural gender enlarged and somehow particularly changed and transposed on metalinguistic level, while the latter is based on multidimensional geometry of properties. The foundation of this geometry stems from quantitative way of thinking applied in counting objects from various perspectives. On the morphological level both types of categorization can be seen as a more abstract category of nominal classes, which are marked with gender endings in Indo-European languages and with adnumeral suffixes in Japanese and other East-Asian languages. There are only two possible ways of distinction within Indo-European type of gender: a semantic and primary one (based on criterion of natural gender: MASC. : FEM. and sometimes also NEUTR.) and a formal and secondary one (based on criterion of noun ending, like in Slavic and Romance languages). In Japanese we have a multilevel and multidimensional categorization which shows a complex structure of object enumeration based on distinct nature, features, substantial properties, shape, utility and perspective. Therefore, the essence of linguistic gender and object classification proves some universal mechanisms in human cognitive experience.

アルカディウシュ・ヤブオニスキ

モダリティ・敬語・意味

モダリティは話者の態度を表す要素として定義されている一方、敬語・敬語表現に関わる概念は社会規範に基づいて取り扱われているのが通常である。すなわち、発話のモダル要素も敬語要素もその命題と異なった性質をもつものとして考えられているようである。菊池と水谷は発話の基本的意味と敬語に関わる性質を別に扱い、水谷は文構造を「コト（事柄 Proposition）＋　ムード（心的態度 Modality）」と考え、待遇表現を記述する。
小論では下記の課題を取り上げたい。

１．モダリティと敬語・敬語表現の文脈的な制限のあり方。
２．モダリティに関わる意味と敬語・敬語表現の意味は「有標」として扱ってよいのか。
３．モダリティと敬語・敬語表現に対しての話者の態度ははたして自由か。
４．モダリティと敬語・敬語表現記述に共通の基盤があるのか。

小論の目的は、敬語をモダリティの観点から扱うことでもなければ、モダリティを敬語として記述することでもない。両概念に根本的と考えられる低レベル要素を探って分析したい。特に神尾が提唱した「情報のなわ張り理論」の概念を強調したい。その概念は直接的にモダリティ・敬語に関わりがないが、文脈要素に深く根ざしている。一般のモダリティの定義では「話者の態度」が述べられている反面、神尾のアプローチでは「発話発生の基本条件はある情報の真偽判断の結果だけでなく、情報の所有権でもある」。
小論では話者モダリティ・敬語に関わる文型の決定はある環境での「場面認知」によって行われていることを強調したい。その意味で、モダリティは Goffman が提唱した「状況の定義づけ」という概念に似ている。抽象化がこのレベルに至れば、もはや前者の意味論的な性質と後者の実用論的な性質との差異がモダリティと敬語・ポライトネスの相互関係を隠蔽しなくなる。

ヤロスワフ・ピエトロフ

性という文法範疇と日本語に於ける助数詞システム――普遍的な文法の分類範疇か？

本研究の目的は日本語における類別詞体系とインド・ヨーロッパの諸言語における性という範疇の比較の試みであり、そのために筆者は名詞類の範疇化や数量的のものの考え方や意味的な対立（自然の性）などの見地から見たさまざまな現象の記述を提案してみた。記述の対象となるインド・ヨーロッパ語型の性の範疇と日本語型の数量的名詞類の間に共通点が見られ、異なる特徴性はものの考え方に由来している。性の範疇の場合、範疇の基礎となる性別という意味要素が次第に広がり、有生名詞の範囲から無生名詞の範囲に広がるとともに、メタ言語（名詞の形式に基づく区別）のものになる。日本語の場合は名詞類がさまざまな範疇化基準に基づき、数量詞の機能によって多次元的に示され、異なる意味的範疇となったことが見られる。この二つの基本的な区別の範疇化は一方、相対的な性質を持っており、他方では普遍的なものの考え方のメカニズムを示している。

AUTORZY / CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿者

Arkadiusz Jabłoński
Associate professor at the Adam Mickiewicz University Institute of Oriental Studies, Department of Japanese Studies, specializing in general and Japanese linguistics. Ph. D. in linguistics at the Oriental Institute, Warsaw University with a thesis on semiotics and pragmatics of contemporary Japanese honorifics in 2001. Currently his interests focus on coherent and code independent model of honorific modification (HM), issues of translation, interpretation and intercultural communication.

Jarosław Pietrow
Ph.D. candidate at the Department of Japanese and Korean Studies, Institute of Oriental Studies, Warsaw University. After obtaining in 2001 his M.A. in Japanese linguistics at the Chair of Oriental Studies, Department of Japanese Studies, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, he moved to Warsaw and became a doctoral student (2002), working on his Ph.D. thesis on „Noun classes in modern Japanese and their adnumeral markers." From April 2004 till April 2006 he had been a research student on Monbukagakushō scholarship at the University of Tsukuba, where he worked under guidance of Prof. Yuriko Sunakawa. His main area of interest is Japanese grammar, including morphology and syntax, as well as theoretical and historical aspects of East-Asian graphemics.

アルカディウシュ・ヤブオニスキ
日本語言語学・一般言語学専攻。アダム・ミツキエヴィッチ大学東洋学研究所日本学科助教授。
2001 年、現代日本語における敬語表現の記号論・語用論に関する博士論文をワルシャワ大学新文献学部東洋学科に提出。現在の主要な研究主題は、情報伝達過程のあらゆる階層に繋がりを持ち、かつあらゆる言語に適応可能な待遇情報(HM)モデルの作成、翻訳・通訳・異文化コミュニケーションに関わる諸課題である。

ヤロスワフ・ピエトロフ
ワルシャワ大学東洋学研究所日本・韓国学科博士課程 5 年在籍。アダム・ミツキエヴィッチ大学の日本学科を卒業後（日本語学専攻、2001）ワルシャワ大学の新文献学部博士課程に入学（2002）。博士論文のテーマは『現代日本語における名詞類及びその連数詞標識』。2004 年 4 月から 2006 年 4 月まで筑波大学文芸・言語学研究所研究生（指導教官：砂川有里子教授）。現在、ワルシャワ大学で日本語学関連科目を教えている。研究分野：日本語文法（形態論、統語論を含めて）、文字論（東アジアの文字の歴史及び理論）。

PRACE NADSYŁANE / FOR CONTRIBUTORS / 投稿

1. Przyjmujemy niepublikowane gdzie indziej dokumenty w formacie MS Word, w objętości do ok. 40 000 znaków z włączeniem spacji. Wymagany język dokumentów do publikacji to angielski lub japoński. W innych językach przyjmowane są wyłącznie tłumaczenia japońskich tekstów.

2. Prosimy dostosować transkrypcję wyrazów japońskich do standardu Hepburna lub Kunrei, przy użyciu dostępnych czcionek. Transkrypcja wyrazów niejapońskich powinna być zgodna ze standardem *de facto* dla danego języka. Redakcja może zasugerować zmianę systemu transkrypcji tekstu.

3. Przypisy powinny znajdować się na dole strony.

4. Do tekstu głównego powinno zostać załączone krótkie streszczenie oraz informacja o autorze w języku angielskim i japońskim.

5. Komitet redakcyjny decyduje o dopuszczeniu tekstu do publikacji i powiadamia o tym fakcie autora.

6. Nadesłanie tekstu oznacza zgodę na jego publikację drukiem i na wprowadzenie do tekstu niezbędnych zmian edytorskich.

7. Teksty prosimy nadsyłać jednocześnie pocztą elektroniczną (wersja elektroniczna) oraz pocztą klasyczną (w formie drukowanej) na następujące adresy:

1. We accept documents unpublished elsewhere in MS Word format, not longer than 40 000 characters including spaces. Documents should be in English or Japanese. Only translations from Japanese may be accepted in other languages.

2. Use available fonts to adjust the romanization of to the Hepburn or Kunrei standard. Words other than Japanese should be romanized according to the *de facto* standard for a given language. We may recommend the change of romanization system.

3. Footnotes should be included on the bottom of the page.

4. Main text should come with short summary and information on the contributor in English and Japanese.

5. The editorial board qualifies a text for publication and notifies the author of this fact.

6. It is understood that by submitting the text the contributors give their consent to its publication in print and to making necessary editorial changes.

7. We await both your e-mail (computer file) and snail mail (printed version) contributions at:

１．MS Word を用いて書かれた４万字以内の未刊行の文章を受領する。用いられるべき言語は英語または日本語である。ただし、日本語テキストからの翻訳については、他言語の文章も受領される。

２．日本語語彙のローマ字表記は、ヘボン式または訓令式とし標準フォントを使用すること。日本語以外の語彙のローマ字表記は、各言語の標準に従う。編集委員会は、ローマ字表記規則の変更を求める場合もある。

３．注釈はページ下に載せる。

４．本文に要約と著者紹介を英語と日本語で付記すること。

５．編集委員会は、投稿された原稿の掲載可否を決定し、その旨を投稿者に通知する。

６．論文は、投稿された段階で、委員会がそれを公刊し、編集上不可避の変更を行うことを許したものと見なす。

７．原稿は、電子メール（電子文書版）と郵便（プリントアウト版）の双方で、下記に送付すること。