Nexus of Language and Culture:
A Study of Second Person Reference Terms in Japanese
with Special Focus on Anata ‘You’

Yoko Yonezawa

December 2016

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of
The Australian National University

© Copyright by Yoko Yonezawa 2016
All Rights Reserved
Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis is the original work of the author except where otherwise stated.

Yoko Yonezawa
Department of Linguistics
School of Culture, History and Language
College of Asia and the Pacific
The Australian National University
Acknowledgements

It would not have been possible to complete this thesis without the help and encouragement of a number of people. First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest thanks to my chief supervisor Duck-Young Lee for his numerous invaluable comments, intellectual criticism, clear advice and warm support. The thesis truly benefited from his insights, precision and efficiency as well as his trust in me to pursue the path I wanted to take. Without his guidance, my thesis would not have been the same.

My thanks also go to my second supervisor Tim Hassall for his professionalism, clear advice and intelligent pragmatism as well as his warm, friendly and sincere support throughout the production of the thesis. I am also profoundly grateful to my adviser Shun’ichi Ikeda for his precise advice on various aspects of Japanese language in this thesis. For the numeric data in my thesis, Yao Ding from the ANU’s Statistical Consulting Unit gave me kind support, boosting my very basic level of knowledge in this area. I also thank Gabriel Schmidt for her practical and kind advice in forming my survey paper.

I greatly appreciate the Australian Postgraduate Award for supporting me financially throughout my PhD program. I also thank the Australian National University for fieldwork funding and grants for conference attendances, which helped immensely the progress of my research and to broaden my experience. At these conferences, I met very supportive fellow researchers and scholars who confirmed to me that there is a shared community of interest in my research area and provided ideas for new scholarly directions I would love to take with them.

The survey which was undertaken as part of this study was distributed and collected with the support of a number of people whom I would like to acknowledge. I would like especially to thank Eriko Ishii, Tomoko Kumagaya, Sumire Goda, students of Tokyo Women’s Christian University, Japan Women’s University and Akita International University, members of my old school alumni of Japan Women’s University, Yuko Abe, Keiko Abe, Yoshihiro Abiko, Masahiro Toma, Masaharu Iida, Hiroki Asakawa, Ji Hye Chung, Takako Nakano, Rika Hogaki, Noriko Sato, for their help in distributing the questionnaire to wider communities and for their interest and
encouragement in the progress of my research. Special thanks also go to the anonymous survey respondents who gave this study the true voice of native speakers of the Tokyo standard-variety of Japanese.

Being a PhD student in linguistics at the ANU has been a privilege. Not only are there numerous seminars and workshops being held regularly, but the informal conversations with fellow students and world-leading scholars in corridors and in the kitchen have greatly helped to deepen my thoughts about languages. I truly enjoyed this luxury in my day to day campus life. I express my gratitude to Nicholas Evans and Alan Rumsey for giving me valuable input about the social aspects of languages, sending me recommended readings and their kind encouragement, and to Anna Wierzbicka for her precious time discussing her thoughts on anata with me. My gratitude also goes to Wayan Arka and Bethwyn Evans for giving me a warm and supportive environment in the Department of Linguistics. I admire the enormous scholarly knowledge of all the scholars I have met at this university. It was truly inspiring.

I wish to thank staff members at the Japan Centre for giving me the opportunity to teach. I wish to thank Carol Hayes, Yuko Kinoshita, and Yuki Itani-Adams for their warm moral support throughout my PhD program and for sharing their own stories as human beings about how to juggle life, work and research. My thanks also go to Nami Matsumoto, Emi Yoshida, Naomi Ogi, Tami Sato, Chikako Senke and Benny Tong for our shared collegiate experiences and their friendship. My gratitude also goes to other staff at the Japan Centre and School of Culture, History and Language, Li Narangoa, Peter Hendriks, Shun’ichi Ishihara, Mark Gibeau and Roald Maliangkaij, who have always provided me with a warm and supportive environment.

I am also immensely grateful to my proof-readers for their time spent making my thesis readable. Here, I wish to pause for a moment to reflect on the experience of writing my thesis in English. Any student faces a great challenge in writing a substantial amount of work in a language which is not their native language. So did I. I do not pretend that this struggle was only a minor part of my PhD effort. In fact, it was a source of frustration and at times even caused something akin to an identity crisis. When I put my survey results together for an article I wrote in Japanese and which was published in a journal in Japan, in order to share the results with people who had helped me, I did it completely independently. I wished I could do the same in English but it was my reality that without
proof readers, my English was never free from errors. This sometimes made me feel that I was not a fully independent adult in the same way I was with my native language. A friend who has worked in the public sector in Australia for 20 years said to me that the biggest hurdle affecting her professional confidence had always been her English. This formed her next and life-time research topic.

More than anyone, my partner Jim has constantly witnessed this frustration and he has always patiently supported me. While saying he knew nothing about linguistics, he sacrificed his time to proofread my chapters, patiently answered my numerous questions and fixed my repetitive errors. Words cannot express the gratitude I have for him. I also thank Alan Jones for his writing workshops, and my friends Orion Lethbridge and Kerri Ng for our informal help exchange program translating between Japanese and English. My thanks also go to editor Maxine MacArthur, who has helped a number of international students and understands their struggle. I believe now that my struggle with language itself is an asset for deepening my understanding about language and human beings. In this sense, writing my PhD thesis has been one of the most rewarding experiences I have had.

My dear fellow PhD students, Narah Lee, Nami Matsumoto, Katerina Naitoro, Eri Kashima, Gian Marco Farese, Kwang-Ju Cho, Owen Edwards, Chris Park, Catherine Hallett, Haruka Woods, Annie Ren, Yishan Huang, Xu Yang, Mark Jones and Chris Weedall, thank you for sharing your passion, thoughts, time and experience as well as your warm and sincere friendship which made coming to the campus a joy.

Also, my dear friends Maria Haenga-Collins, Belinda Vangchihia, Kimlong Chheng, Savitri Gurung, Jyotsna Tamang, Channa Razaque, Ronald Holmes, Samunda Perera, Yasuko Kobayashi, Masahiro Toma, Chie Adachi, Jeremy Jones, Adam Croft and others who became like a family to me at Graduate House – thank you all so much for sharing with me your time, tea, food, chat, tears and laughs.

Back home in Japan, I have my family who deserve acknowledgement. My parents Toshiyuki and Keiko, my sisters Noriko and Rika, thank you all for your faith in me and constant unconditional love and cheering from a distance.

Last but not least, my biggest thanks go to my partner Jim and our daughter Natsuko. No words can express the gratitude I have for them. I did my PhD with the full support of Jim and Natsuko, who never questioned why I was doing this. Without their
love, understanding and acceptance, and without the life of the three of us as a family, this thesis would never have been possible. Thank you for all your love and support.
Abstract

This study explores the use of the second person pronoun *anata* ‘you’, with special reference to its functions and effects in Modern Japanese.

Japanese has a complex system of personal reference terms. Their use is primarily determined by the social characteristics of the interlocutors, such as age, gender, kin relations and social status, as well as the level of formality of the conversational setting. This personal reference system is one of the linguistic resources used to comply with the important social norm of Japanese communication that requires constant acknowledgement of the relationship between interlocutors.

Among the various personal reference terms, this study focuses on a particular second person pronoun *anata* ‘you’. *Anata* was originally a demonstrative directional reference term ‘that way’ and came to be used euphemistically to refer to an addressee as a politeness strategy. It was later semanticised as a formal/polite second person pronoun. The politeness value of *anata* has declined over time and in Modern Japanese, its properties have been unclear. A survey undertaken for this study has found that present-day native speakers of Japanese report that they do not use *anata* as a regular/default term. Instead, they perceive the term as entailing disparate nuances.

Uncertainty about the properties of *anata* is apparent in the previous literature of Japanese linguistics. Some studies have treated *anata* as a formal/polite pronoun while others have regarded its use as entailing an impolite nuance. It has also been pointed out that *anata* has a certain function of controlling interlocutors’ distance. One of the major issues of the previous literature is that these studies have tended to focus only on partial aspects of the use of *anata* and consequently the core properties of this term have not been fully explored in an integrated manner.

In empirically clarifying the use of *anata* through discourse analysis, the current study reveals that an indication of the degree of politeness or the interlocutors’ social characteristics are not genuine properties of *anata*. By adopting the notion of ‘absolute specification’, this study reveals that *anata*’s core property is its ability to absolutely specify the second person entity without displaying any of the interlocutors’ social elements. This property makes it possible for *anata* to occur in particular contexts, such as its impersonal use in reported speech or when referring to a general audience.
same time, this property creates strong expressive effects in socially typified relationships. This is because its use does not display the interlocutors’ social relationship and hence conflicts with the socio-cultural norm of ‘relationship acknowledgement’ in Japanese communication.

In this study, I attempt to systematically explain the mechanisms of how this inherent property of anata, absolute specification, interacts with established socio-cultural practices of the personal reference system in Japanese and creates expressive effects which cause users to attach disparate social meanings (e.g. polite, impolite, distant or intimate) to this word. In so doing, the study sheds light on some important aspects of the nexus between language and culture.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Aims and background

The aim of this study is to clarify the nature of the second person pronoun anata ‘you’, with special reference to its functions and effects in Modern Japanese and thereby to shed light on some aspects of the interface between language and culture.

It is well known that personal pronouns, as well as other numerous personal reference terms, fulfill not only referential functions but also a variety of non-referential or social functions (Jespersen, 1929; Jakobson, 1971 [1957]; Brown and Gilman, 1960; Brown and Ford, 1961; Ervin-Tripp, 1969; Peng, 1982; Silverstein, 1985; Braun, 1988; Wilson, 1990; Dickey, 1997; Agha, 2007; Enfield and Stivers, 2007; Wardhaugh, 2011).


(1) *Sensei wa doo omowaremasu ka.*
    2P: teacher TOP how think-HON QUE
    ‘What do you (sensei) think?’

(2) *Okaasan wa doo omou?*
    2P: mother TOP how think-INF
    ‘What do you (okaasan) think?’

(3) *Omae wa doo omou?*
    2PP: omae TOP how think-INF
    ‘What do you (omae) think?’

In all examples (1) to (3), the speaker is asking ‘what do you think?’ to the addressee. However, each sentence denotes different information about the interlocutors.

Example (1) illustrates the use of an occupational term as a second person reference term. Titles and occupational terms such as *shachoo* ‘president (of a company)’ and *sensei* ‘teacher’ are commonly used as second person reference terms in Japanese when talking to socially superior addressees, appearing both in vocative and pronominal slots. In example (1), the speaker is referring to the addressee as *sensei*. In Japanese, when talking not only to one’s teacher but also to someone who serves in occupations such as doctor or politician, *sensei* is normally used as a second person reference term (Suzuki, 1973:132, 1978: 91; Ide, 1982: 359, 2006: 73).
Example (2) shows the use of a kinship term as a second person reference. Kinship terms are also used both in vocative and pronominal slots, just like titles and occupational terms. Normally, younger members of a family use kinship terms to address older members of the family (Suzuki, 1973: 151, 1978: 105). For example, children address their parents with kinship terms such as otoosan ‘father’ and okaasan ‘mother’ instead of using a second person pronoun. In example (2), the speaker is talking to his/her mother with the use of okaasan as a second person reference.

Example (3) illustrates the use of a second person pronoun. With second person pronouns in Japanese, there are a number of items available to indicate ‘you’, such as anta, omae, kimi, kisama and temee. The use of these items is sensitive to social characteristics of the interlocutors and especially restrictive for a socially inferior speaker towards a superior addressee. In example (3), the speaker uses an informal second person pronoun omae ‘you’ to refer to the addressee. Omae is predominantly used by male speakers in casual settings to refer to an addressee of equal or inferior status to the speaker (Ide, 1990a: 58, 1990b: 73-74; Shibatani, 1990: 371).

Merely glancing at the above examples, we can see that the use of personal reference terms in Japanese inevitably indicates various information about social elements of the interlocutors. In other words, ‘social placedness’ (Evans, 1993: 250) of the interlocutors is encoded in the use of these terms even without any contextual information in the above examples (1) to (3).

It should be noted that in Japanese, first and second person reference terms are often omitted in spoken conversation (Kuno, 1978; Hinds, 1978, 1982; Shibamoto-Smith, 1983; Okamoto, 1985; Kameyama, 1985; Shibatani, 1990; Makino, 1993; Okazaki, 1994; Nariyama, 2003; Fujii, 2013). For example, unless a different subject
has been otherwise specified earlier in the related discourse, an omitted subject is interpreted as the speaker, i.e. first person subject, in declarative sentences as shown in the brief expression, *Ikimasu* ‘(I) will go’, and as the listener, i.e. second person subject, in interrogative sentences as in *Ikimasu ka* ‘Will (you) go?’.

Thus, the overt specification of different first and second person reference terms in Japanese inevitably displays the speaker’s specific ‘social attitude’ toward the listener (Lee and Yonezawa, 2008).

Note also that Japanese language does not have a cross-reference system between the subject and the verb in a sentence, therefore, the combination of any personal reference terms and verb forms can be grammatically possible. However, the mismatch of the social elements indicated in a personal reference term with a verb form can cause incongruence.

(3)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2PP: omae</th>
<th>TOP</th>
<th>how</th>
<th>think-HON</th>
<th>QUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>omae</td>
<td>doo</td>
<td>omowaremasu</td>
<td>ka.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example (3)’, the co-occurrence of an informal second person pronoun *omae* and the honorific form of the verb *omowaremasu* is grammatically possible. However, it is pragmatically incongruent in normal circumstances.

---

1 Also, in some cases, the type of predicate provides a clue to help identify the omitted subject (Backhouse, 1993). In Japanese, there is a group of predicates which exclusively indicate the inner state (desire, feeling, thought, etc.) of the speaker, and thus their subject is interpreted as being the speaker in declarative sentences, and as the listener in interrogative sentences, basically in any case, e.g. *Eiga mitai* ‘(I) want to watch a movie’ or *Eiga mitai?* ‘Do (you) want to watch a movie?’, but *Taro wa eiga ga mitai* with the intended meaning of ‘Taro [= a third person] wants to watch a movie’. In addition to the linguistic means noted here, further means are used to disambiguate the intended subject in Japanese, such as honorification, e.g. *Mooshiagemashita* ‘(I) told (you); *mooshiageru* = tell (humble)’, and situational context, e.g. (pointing to a movie advertisement in a newspaper) *Omoshirosooda ne* ‘(This movie) looks interesting’, etc. The mechanism of disambiguating the intended subject in Japanese is well documented in Hinds (1982), Okamoto (1985), Okazaki (1994) and Nariyama (2003).
Among the various personal reference terms, this study focuses on a second person pronoun *anata* ‘you’, that is unique amongst Japanese personal reference terms. *Anata* was originally a demonstrative directional reference term ‘that way’ and came to be used euphemistically to refer to an addressee as a politeness strategy (Ishiyama, 2008). It was later semanticised as a formal/polite second person pronoun. The politeness value of *anata* has declined over time (Sakuma, 1959; Yamazaki, 1963; Tsujimura, 1968; Hashiguchi, 1998; Barke and Uehara, 2005; Ishiyama, 2008, 2012; Miwa, 2010). Following these processes, its properties in Modern Japanese have been unclear and the term has been regarded as ‘unique’ (Jung, 1999: 27). Its uniqueness is reflected in the following respects.

Firstly, *anata* does not convey specific social information about the interlocutors when there is no contextual information. Observe the following examples.

(4)  *Anata* wa *doo* omoimasu *ka*.

2PP: *anata* TOP how think-FOR QUE

‘What do you (*anata*) think?’

(5)  *Anata* wa *doo* omou?

2PP: *anata* TOP how think-INF

‘What do you (*anata*) think?’

In the above examples (4) and (5), the propositional information of the utterances is the same, that is, the speaker is asking ‘what do you think?’ to the addressee. As seen in both examples, the use of *anata* can co-occur with both the formal style *omoimasu* *ka* and the informal style *omou*. That is to say, the use of *anata* is possible in both formal and informal contexts. In terms of the social elements of the speaker, without additional contextual information, it is not possible to immediately judge the speaker’s biographical
characteristics such as gender, age and social status, nor the status relationship between the interlocutors. This leads us to form the impression that *anata* can be a multifunctional, general second person pronoun in Japanese and its use may be much less restricted than other personal reference terms. Jung (1999) described *anata* as somewhat ‘insensitive’ to the degree of politeness.

In fact, because of this ‘generic’ sense of *anata*, *Kokugo Shingikai* ‘The National Language Council of Japan’ defined *anata* as a ‘standard form’ of address in a proposal entitled *Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorifics for the Future’ in 1952. The proposal was published under the influence of the emerging ideology of democracy after World War II (cf. Chapter 8). It was aimed at encouraging a less complicated use of honorifics as well as simpler use of personal reference terms in Japanese. While it was believed by policy makers, including language professionals and linguists, to be reasonable to use *anata* towards any addressee as a standard second person reference term, in reality, *anata* has never gained a central position as a standard address term among native speakers of Japanese.

On the contrary, native speakers express a great deal of difficulty in using *anata* and tend to avoid it. This is the second element of uniqueness amongst Japanese personal pronouns. As will be shown in Section 1.4, the use of *anata* is strikingly infrequent in the ordinary conversation corpus compared to other second person reference terms. Also, the results of the self-reported survey discussed in Chapter 4 show that native speakers would very rarely use *anata* as a regular term in any of the following cases: when referring to an addressee of higher status; when referring to an addressee of lower status; and when referring to an addressee of equal status. Instead,
responses by the native speaking informants reveal a number of incongruities in how the term is perceived.

Thirdly, dictionaries of Modern Japanese define *anata* in several distinct ways. Jinnouchi (1998: 48) categorised the definitions of *anata* among Modern Japanese dictionaries into the following three groups:

(i) *anata* is an address term used with respect
(ii) *anata* does not indicate respect and is only used towards an addressee of socially equal or lower status to the speaker
(iii) *anata* used to be an honorific address term but this is not the case today.

While my own consultation of fifteen recent Japanese dictionaries\(^2\) is in principle in line with Jinnouchi’s (1998) categorisations, it revealed that there are some dictionaries that hesitate to provide a clear definition. For example, *Koojien* fifth edition (1998) states as follows:

*Kinsei\(^3\) igo, meue ya doohai de aru aite o uyamate sasu go. Genkon wa keii no doai ga genjite iru.*

‘Since the Edo period, it has been an address term to refer to a superior or an equal with respect. Recently, the degree of respect has been declining.’


---


\(^3\) The word *kinsei* literally means ‘early modern time’. In Japanese history, this is commonly regarded as the Edo period (1603-1867) when Japan was governed by the *Tokugawa shogun*. 
Although the above description indicates that the politeness value of *anata* has declined over time, it does not make it clear to what extent it has declined. From this description, the properties of *anata* in Modern Japanese are indeed unclear.

Ambiguity in dictionary definition can cause confusion among native speakers who consult a number of these dictionaries. One of the editorial members of *Sanseido Kokugo Jiten* ‘Sanseido Japanese Dictionary’ revealed in an interview for the Asahi newspaper that *anata niwa ichiban kushin shita* ‘Anata racked our brain the most’ when they were compiling the dictionary (Asahi Shimbun: 04/11/1976). Scholars described the word as ‘touchy’ and ‘difficult to use’ (Miwa, 2010: 4), having ‘multi-meanings’ (Jinnouchi, 1998: 40), hence it was *dokutoku* ‘unique’ (Jung, 1999: 27) among various Japanese personal reference terms.

Fourthly, notwithstanding the difficulties in defining this pronoun and the incongruities of native speakers’ perceptions regarding the use of the term *anata*, previous studies that explore *anata* intensively have been sporadic in the field of Japanese linguistics. Since studies of personal reference terms tend to focus on the entire system of personal reference in Japanese, they tend to touch only briefly on the use of *anata* and lack an in-depth analysis of the term.

Interestingly, the previous studies also reveal that there are several distinct ways of viewing *anata*. Some studies treat *anata* as a formal second person pronoun or point out that it entails a polite nuance (Lee, 1976; Tani, 1981; Ide, 1990b, 1992b, 2006; Shibatani, 1990; Kanamaru, 1997; Saito, 1999; Barke and Uehara, 2005; Ishiyama, 2008; Muramatsu and Xie, 2015), while others argue that the use of *anata* is often perceived as impolite, especially when used towards a socially superior addressee (Suzuki, 1973, 1978; Kindaichi, 1988; Morita, 1989; Jinnouchi, 1998; Jung, 2003; Kanai,
It has also been reported that *anata* can be used in some close relationships such as when a wife refers to her husband (Tani, 1981; Morita, 1989; Araki, 1990; Saito, 1999; Otaka, 1999), while there is also a view that the use of *anata* creates a distance between the interlocutors (Sanada, 1997; Hirota, 1998; Ide, 2006). Given this, there is a mystery around why this one personal pronoun generates such disparate views.

In fact, none of these views is wrong and the previous studies have offered insightful analyses in their own right. Yet they have also tended to focus only on partial aspects of the use of *anata* and as a result have failed to provide an integrated analysis of its usage. For example, as will be shown in Chapter 2, the ‘polite view’ only sheds light on the use of *anata* in formal settings and is incapable of explaining cases where *anata* creates an impolite nuance. Likewise, the ‘impolite’ view is only partially persuasive as it has difficulty explaining why *anata* can be used politely or in a formal setting. To the best of my knowledge, a systematic explanation which unites disparate views about the use of *anata* has not been provided in the existing literature of Japanese linguistics. In other words, the conditions, functions and effects of the use of *anata* have not been comprehensively and empirically clarified. Therefore, the current study ultimately aims at identifying the functions of the use of *anata*, by providing systematic analysis to address the following research questions:

(i) How do native speakers of Japanese perceive the use of *anata* as a current norm?
(ii) What are the environments in which *anata* occurs in different types of discourse?
(iii) What are the inherent properties of *anata*?
(iv) What are the functions and effects of the use of *anata*?
(v) What are the mechanisms that create these functions and effects in relation to given socio-cultural contexts?

(vi) How was *anata* ideologically positioned in post war language policy and society?

In responding systematically to these questions, I highlight the fact that applying socio-cultural knowledge plays a crucial role. Through discussion of this personal reference term within particular cultural contexts, this study ultimately sheds light on some aspects of the nexus between language and culture.

1.2. Scope

In this section, I delineate the scope of the current study.

First, in Japanese there are a number of dialectal variations concerning the use of personal references and some scholars have studied the use of personal reference terms in a particular dialect (Fujiwara, 1982, 2000; Izuyama, 1994; Kori, 2003; Kadoya, 2009; *inter alia*). Examining particular features of personal reference terms in a variety of dialects is indeed an interesting avenue for research; however, in the limited time frame of my PhD program, I focus on the Tokyo standard-variety.

It is commonly accepted among scholars that standard Japanese is historically based on the Tokyo variety but generally understood anywhere in Japan (Tanaka, 1991, 1996; Yasuda, 1999; Koyama, 2004). The Tokyo standard-variety is “in principle

---

4 For example, these studies focus on: the use of personal pronouns in Ryukyu—the former kingdom of Okinawa and Hachijo-jima—a small island located in the Philippine Sea and administered by Tokyo (Izuyama, 1994); first person pronouns in Hirosaki city in Aomori (Kori, 2003); and the use of sentence final particles derived from personal reference terms in Kyushu (Kadoya, 2009). There are further a wide range of variations concerning various first and second person pronouns in different dialects. See Fujiwara (2000) for details.
The current study focuses on the Tokyo standard-variety and throughout this thesis the term ‘Japanese’ indicates the Tokyo standard-variety of Japanese, unless otherwise specified.

Second, in terms of the use of *anata*, it may appear in the vocative slot or in the pronoun slot and this study includes both uses in its analysis. It has been pointed out that these two uses should be distinguished in linguistic analysis since each use has different functions and conventions (Jinnouchi, 1990; Schegloff 1996b; Dickey 1997, Takubo, 1997; Morita, 2003). For example, Schegloff (1996b: 472) states that the second person pronoun ‘you’ in English may be regarded as ‘rude and offensive’ when used as a vocative and this use should be analysed separately from the use of ‘you’ in the pronoun slot.

However, in Japanese, the distinction can be ambiguous as to whether a particular personal reference term is used as a vocative or a second person reference term in the pronoun slot (Morita, 2003). This is partly because Japanese has ellipsis of topic/subject and particles (Hinds, 1982; Shibatani, 1990, Nariyama, 2003). Observe the following examples.

(6)  *Anata*  wa  *doo*  omou?
    2PP: *anata*  TOP  how  think-INF
    ‘What do you (*anata*) think?’

---

According to Yasuda (1999), ‘Standard Japanese’ is a ‘Tokyo variety’ which was ‘standardised’ by the nation and considered as the ‘lingua franca’ or ‘capital language’. Koyama (2004) also states that standard varieties, such as the Modern Tokyo standard Japanese, are consciously articulated, ideologically prescribed normative standards which are in principle accessible to anyone (the ‘public’ in a strong sense) and to which speakers’ behavioural and ideological (dis)loyalty indexes their group identities and power-statuses. See Yasuda (1999) and Koyama (2004) for more details.
Example (6) does not have any ellipsis and anata here is regarded as occurring in a pronoun slot that is topicalised by being marked by the topic marker wa. Regarding (7) and (8), in example (7), the topic marker wa is omitted whereas in example (8), the speaker first addressed the hearer using a vocative anata and then omitted both the topic and the topic marker. The problem here is that in actual utterances, sentences (7) and (8) are identical and it is in fact impossible to distinguish the interpretation of these two uses of anata as a vocative use or a pronominal use. Also, it is well known that Japanese has a phenomenon of ‘scrambling’ in terms of its word order (Harada, 1977; Whitman, 1979; Saito, 1985; Tsujimura, 1996). The combination of these phenomena makes it difficult to clearly distinguish uses of a second person reference term in the vocative slot or in the pronoun slot in Japanese in many cases. In this study, I include all uses of anata and aim at a comprehensive analysis of its use in interaction. I use the phrase ‘second person reference term’ in a broad sense, including uses of anata in both the vocative slot and the pronominal slot. ‘Personal reference terms’ includes a variety of terms used throughout the study to refer to, or address, the first, second and/or third person.

Third, this study investigates the use of anata in Modern Japanese. Analysis is based on recent materials described in Section 1.4. The investigation of the historical transformation of the use of personal pronouns is another interesting topic. However, it
is not my intention to explore the full range of diachronic evidence of the use of anata here. I will, however, touch on the historical transformation of anata in Chapter 3 as relevant background knowledge to a discussion of the term. On this point, Silverstein’s (1985) statement is helpful:

The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use, mediated by the fact of cultural ideology. And the linguistic fact is irreducibly dialectic, whether we view it as so-called synchronic usage or as so-called diachronic change. It is an indifferently synchronic-diachronic totality which, however, at least initially—in keeping with traditional autonomous divisions of scholarly perspective—can be considered from the points of view of language structure, contextualized usage, and ideologies of language.

(Silverstein, 1985: 220)

As stated above, synchronic investigation of a particular word and its contextualised usage are inseparable from the understanding of a diachronic transformation of the word in the sense that the interpretation of indexical value at a point in history is “always available for reinterpretation” (Eckert, 2008: 463) and “once established, this new value is available for further construal, and so on” (Eckert, 2008: 463-464). Further, such reconstruals are “always already immanent” (Silverstein, 2003: 194) because they occur “within a fluid and ever-changing ideological field” (Eckert, 2008: 464).

Finally, it should be noted that throughout the study, all the use cases are of a ‘non-gendered’ use of anata, except for a wife’s use of anata towards her husband. Among all the uses of anata, a wife’s use of anata is the only gender-specific use and is a female exclusive use of anata. This use of anata is a special case in that only a small number
of women over the age of 40 surveyed reported its use, but no younger women did (cf Chapter 4). It has also been stereotypically regarded as an archaic usage and something that is not used very much nowadays. I will pay special attention to this case, and discuss it separately, in the last section of Chapter 8. All other discussions throughout this thesis relate to non-gender specific uses of anata.

1.3. Methodology

To achieve a comprehensive analysis, the current study employed mixed methods combining a self-reported survey of native speakers’ perceptions and discourse analysis, focusing on the use of anata.

The survey was a paper-based questionnaire, asking native speakers of the Tokyo standard-variety in what situations and to whom they would use anata. It sought responses from a broad range of people, i.e. both men and women from a wide range of generations. In terms of the advantages of the use of questionnaires, Dickey (1997) points out their ability to obtain some types of information which may not usually be easily accessible. For example, a family interaction (outside the researchers’ own family) tends to be difficult to obtain. In line with this point, the questionnaire in this study asked about the use of anata in a variety of relationships including family members, couples and lovers and so forth.

It should be noted that in previous studies, there are some works which also integrate surveys to investigate native speakers’ use of personal reference terms (e.g. Yoneda, 1990; Kanamaru, 1997; Otaka, 1999; Jung, 2003; Spehri Badi, 2011, 2012, 2013). Among them, some surveys focus on the use of personal reference terms in specific settings such as the work place (Yoneda, 1990), among family members (Spehri
Badi, 2011, 2012, 2013) and in specific assumed settings given by the author (Jung, 2003). Others conducted their survey with a particular group of respondents such as university students (Otaka, 1999). While the findings of these studies are useful, information obtained regarding the use of *anata* is limited and not suitable for generalisation when identifying the specific properties of *anata*. To the best of my knowledge, no published studies have addressed native speakers’ perceptions over a wide range of age groups focusing solely on the use of *anata*. The survey in this study fills this gap by collecting a large number of native speakers’ views towards the term. The details of the survey will be discussed in Chapter 4.

The aim of the questionnaire was not only to ask in what situations and to whom native speakers report using *anata*, but also to collect the speakers’ meta-linguistic reflections on the use of *anata*, that is, their logic behind the use or non-use of *anata*. It is a way of observing aspects of their beliefs about norms and linguistic/language ideology. Rumsey (1990: 346) broadly defines linguistic ideology as “shared bodies of commonsense notions about the nature of language.” Silverstein (1979: 193) defines linguistic ideologies as “sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as a rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use.” As Woolard and Schieffelin (1994: 69) point out, modern linguists tend to undermine the importance of linguistic ideology and prescriptive norms. Regarding this tendency, Silverstein (1985) argues that a grasp of language ideology is important and metalinguistic discourse is a condition for identifying ideology. Silverstein (1985: 223) states as follows:

Any statements about language are indeed metalinguistic statements, since they take language as the very topic of discourse; ideological analysis studies to what extent such statements are rationalized, perhaps systematically, in culturally
understandable terms as the socially emergent reflectivity of actors themselves. How are doctrines of ‘correctness’ and ‘incorrectness’ in language usage rationalized? How are they related to doctrines of inherent representational power, beauty, expressiveness, et cetera of language as a valued mode of action? Such questions can be studied from the point of view of ideological and cultural analysis.

(Silverstein, 1985: 223)

What is relevant to the current analysis of the use of *anata* in connection with Silverstein’s remarks above is that the use of *anata* is related strongly to the pragmatic ‘appropriateness’ of its use, rather than grammatical ‘correctness’ or ‘incorrectness’, crucially so in relation to social-cultural norms in Japanese discourse. This appropriateness is not measurable in a fixed manner as grammatical forms can be. The speaker’s assumptions, beliefs and values about language mediate particular uses of the term and “the contextual dimensions that are thereby made relevant to those interactions” (Morford, 1997: 6). These beliefs “govern their language use and interpretation of linguistic practices” (Morford, 1997: 6).

Haviland (1979: 209), in his work on one of the Australian Aboriginal languages, Guugu Yimidhirr, observes that when people:

[T]heorize and talk about language, they concentrate on its social aspects…[W]ords are not simply linguistic units. They belong to people (their rightful users), and they have striking social properties, rendering them appropriate or inappropriate to different circumstances.

(Haviland, 1979: 209)
Rumsey (1990: 353) also notes the importance of pragmatic function explicated by native speakers’ metalinguistic reflections. The following reminiscence of his fieldwork experience is interesting and insightful.

I once asked a Ngatinyin man for the meaning of *baba*, which I had heard him use, apparently as a term of address. I later realized that it was the ‘vocative’ kin term for *mamingi* ‘my mother’s father’, ‘my mother’s brother’s son’, and so on (cf. Sheffler, 1978: 388ff., Rumsey, 1981). But what this man said in order to explain its ‘meaning’ was ‘Baba, that like a *jannguli* [‘give me’], give me tobacco, or thing like that.’ What he was giving me was obviously not what we would think of as the sense, or possible reference of the term, but rather, a locution that makes explicit the pragmatic function of this term of address within a typical context of use — *mamingi* being someone from whom I am entitled to demand things.

(Rumsey, 1990: 353)

Such observations suggest that referential-propositional functions are not necessarily central to many language practices. The use of a particular term is deeply tied to context that is inescapably culture-dependent. The current study makes use of the survey to find out what aspects of social norms interact with speakers’ beliefs and values and how these values can possibly govern the use of *anata*.

Having discussed the virtues of perceptual data, it is also important to be aware that there are some shortcomings in the survey method. Risks related to questionnaires in linguistic investigation are well known (Wolfson, 1976; Dale 1978; Drew and Heritage, 1992). For example, Drew and Heritage (1992) point out that methods such as questionnaires in language practices tend to rely too much on what respondents believe they do instead of what they actually do. While I take the stance that being aware of speakers’ ‘belief’ is still important as described earlier, I also recognise that examining
actual discourse is essential for empirical study. This is precisely what makes this study’s employment of discourse analysis imperative. In tandem with native speakers’ perceptual data, the current study relies to a large extent on discourse analysis to empirically and comprehensively investigate the use of *anata*. Chapters 5 and 6 will focus on this method.

Regarding the term ‘discourse analysis’, there are many definitions in the literature. It is used not only in linguistics but also in a variety of disciplines such as anthropology, philosophy, cognitive psychology, social psychology and artificial intelligence (Schiffrin et al., 2001: 1). In fact, Schiffrin (1994: 418) notes that “discourse cannot be analyzed – even if one considers one’s analysis linguistically motivated and linguistically relevant – through one discipline alone”. Brown and Yule (1983) state that even within sub-disciplines of linguistics such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics, speech act theory, conversation analysis, psycholinguistics, philosophical linguistics and computational linguistics, the term is used to refer to a wide range of activities depending on the focus of the analysis. Given this, Simpson (1998: 236) states that “the term ‘discourse analysis’ is both ambiguous and controversial”. It has different meanings in different fields.

Among the various definitions of ‘discourse’, it is helpful to refer to Schiffrin, et al. (2001: 1). They clarify these definitions into three main categories: (i) ‘anything beyond the sentence’, (ii) ‘language use’, and (iii) ‘a broader range of social practice that includes nonlinguistic and nonspecific instances of language’. Schiffrin (1994: 414ff) also argues that the view of ‘language as social interaction’ probably best unites different approaches to the analysis of discourse, stating as follows:
It is difficult to separate language from the rest of the world. It is this ultimate inability to separate language from how it is used in the world in which we live that provides the most basic reason for the interdisciplinary basis of discourse analysis. To understand the language of discourse, then, we need to understand the world in which it resides…

(Schiffrin, 1994: 419)

The relevance of Schiffrin’s (1994) remarks to the current analysis of the use of anata is that anata’s use is highly dependent on the context. Thus, it is fundamental for us to look at the use of this second person pronoun within a particular socio-cultural context. Furthermore, where the use of anata creates different effects in interaction — polite, impolite, intimate or distant — this must be explained at the level of the context of the situation and from the perspective of discourse organisation.

Therefore, the larger part of the current study is devoted to an investigation into the use of anata within the parameters of discourse analysis. In doing so, I adopt related key concepts such as the system of personal reference terms in Japanese and social norms in Japanese communication, to offer a synthetic approach to the functions of this particular and mysterious term in social interaction. I will discuss these concepts in detail in Chapter 3.

1.4. Data and presentation

The data for this study comes from a variety of sources from different genres (the full references for the data are given in ‘Data Sources’ under ‘Bibliography’). Firstly, the study adopts a corpus of ordinary conversations.
The Corpus of Japanese Spoken Language from ‘Basic Transcription System for Japanese — Japanese Conversation 1’ (one hundred and sixteen conversations in total; approximately twenty-four hours) (Usami, 2007)\(^6\)

In the data set, a different pair of native speakers of Japanese carries out each conversation.\(^7\) The data set includes conversations between either two males, two females or a male and a female, whose ages vary. Also, the conversations are in a wide variety of settings such as by telephone, debating, a first meeting and a casual chat between friends. Using Usami’s data helps the analysis of conversations in two respects.

One is that the examination of the already transcribed conversation corpus helped avoid the risk of time wasting in the sense that I did not need to record conversations and transcribe them myself only to eventually find out that there were not enough samples in order to analyse the use of *anata*. As there was already an assumption that the use of *anata* would be infrequent in daily conversations, it was a rational decision. In fact, as assumed, the frequency of the use of *anata* appeared to be very low in this corpus which is based on ‘ordinary’ conversations in daily life. That is, within the total of twenty-four hours of conversational data, *anata* occurs only twenty-one times out of the total of five hundred and twenty overt uses of second person reference terms. Discovering this in the early stages allowed me to move on to other sources and genres for further and more in-depth analysis with a sufficient number of examples. That said, I include this corpus in my data. This is because it is important evidence of the infrequent

\(^6\) I thank Professor Mayumi Usami at Tokyo University of Foreign Studies for allowing me to use the corpus. Note that all data in the corpus are transcripts in Japanese only, and when I present data as examples I supply the gloss and English translations.

\(^7\) Only a few participants spoke dialects that are different from that spoken in Tokyo. Their utterances are excluded from an analysis of the current study in order to be consistent with the issue of dialects (the current study deals with the Tokyo standard-variety of Modern Japanese only, as noted in 1.2).
occurrence of the use of *anata* in ordinary conversations. At the same time, after the analysis of other sources, the small number of examples that were in the corpus came to make sense and could be systematically clarified. Some example sentences in this thesis are drawn from the corpus.

The other aspect is that the participants in the corpus are not the same group of people with whom I conducted the survey. For this reason, the use of the corpus naturally circumvents the ‘Observer’s Paradox’ (Labov, 1978). Using Usami’s corpus (2007) freed me from the concern that participants may have an awareness of the study’s focus and the risk that their attention to personal reference terms could affect their production of these terms.

Moving onto other sources, the study also adopts data from different materials such as parliamentary debates, television dramas and advertisements, which make up the bulk of material used in the discourse analysis. The details of these sources are as follows:

(ii) Parliamentary debates


This system includes all parliamentary debates since 1947, all of which are transcribed and open to the public, being accessible online. In this study, I focus on various debates during a single year (as noted above). The details of the minutes are shown in Chapter 7.

Next, the study adopts data from the following television drama series.
(iii) TV dramas

a. *Kiken na Aneki* ‘My Dangerous Older Sister’ (Kaneko, Hayashi and Watanabe, 2005)
b. *Kaseifu no Mita* ‘The Housekeeper Mita’ (Yukawa, 2011)
c. *Riigaru Hai* ‘Legal High’ (Kosawa, 2012)
d. *Kazoku Geemu* ‘Family Game’ (Muto, 2013)

Each drama focuses on different types of relationships and settings, such as between siblings in *Kiken na Aneki* ‘My Dangerous Older Sister’, within families and between family members and a house keeper (*Kaseifu no Mita* ‘The Housekeeper Mita’), between a lawyer and a plaintiff/accused/witness in a courtroom (*Riigaru Hai* ‘Legal High’) and between a teacher and a student (*Kazoku Geemu* ‘Family Game’). Looking at the variety of settings and types of relationships allowed a more reliable analysis.

It should be noted that there may be a concern as to the legitimacy of selecting dramas for linguistic analysis. Expressions in dramas may be somewhat exaggerated and can be different from ordinary conversation. However, analysing dramas also has some great advantages.

Firstly, dramas include abundant visual information and hence the immediate context of a situation is fairly easy to observe and experience (Maynard, 2000: 279). Secondly, information necessary for interpretation in given contexts is foregrounded for the sake of the audience and thus tends to be clear (ibid). Thirdly, dramas can often include situations that show an upsurge of emotion, such as a speaker’s emotional conflicts and hidden feelings. These are aspects of language usage which are very difficult to capture in ordinary daily conversations. Dramas make it possible for us to observe these aspects (Maynard, 2000: 152-153).
Maynard (2001b: 6) further states that “language used in popular television drama is a part of the speech culture, a speech created for mass consumption, and is indeed shared by the masses”. Koyano (1996) also points out that the relationship between naturally occurring speech and the speech observed in dramas is bi-directional, that is, they influence each other. For these reasons I maintain that analysing dramas does allow for reliable conclusions.

Finally, the study adopts various types of advertisements.

(iv) Advertisements

Advertising is one of the genres in which the use of anata is frequently observed. I have collected various advertisements via the Internet, through friends and by myself during my fieldwork. They are from newspapers and webpages, posters in subway stations, and fliers distributed in the Tokyo Metropolitan Area. The use of anata in advertisements is discussed in Chapter 5.

Moving on to data presentation, when I present example sentences for the purpose of discourse analysis, their sources are given at the end of the examples in the following manner:

(i) Conversations from the conversational corpus (Usami, 2007): C + the number of a conversation file
    e.g. (C1), (C2), (C3)

(ii) Parliamentary Debate: The name of the committee meeting + date/month/year
    e.g. (Financial committee meeting, 05/08/2012)

(iii) Dramas: The name of the drama + the episode number
e.g. *(Kiken na Aneki, 2)*

(iv) Advertisement: The name of the advertiser + year collected

e.g. (McDonald’s, 2014)

When examples are extracted from sources other than the above data sets, an indication of this is provided at the end of the examples. Examples which do not have any indication of source are constructed by me.

For each example in this study, Romanisation is used to represent Japanese scripts. The study adopts the Hepburn system for the Romanisation of Japanese but with one modification, namely, long vowels are expressed by a succession of two short vowels such as *aa, ii, uu, ei* (*ei* is used for the long vowel of *e*, which is widely accepted as a convention in the literature of Japanese linguistics) and *oo*, following the convention in the literature, instead of short vowels with superscript diacritics such as *ā, ĩ, ū, ē* and *ō*.

Under the Romanised Japanese sentences, English glosses and English translations are provided. Note that for the purpose of consistency, the transcription conventions including the abbreviations for glosses and Romanisation of Japanese in the original data (if they have already been supplied in the data) may be modified. Also, when the original data does not have the gloss and/or English translation, they are supplied by me.

In English translations, words or phrases in single brackets, i.e. (*   *), indicate that they do not appear in Japanese utterances, but are provided to assist the reader’s comprehension of the intended meanings of the utterances. Names of participants in example sentences have been replaced with an initial, using letters such as ‘A’ or ‘B’. If

---

8 The exceptions are that long vowels are not indicated in the names of Japanese authors or publishers in the text or the Bibliography.
the speaker and the listener have the same initial, two letters are used such as ‘Sg’ and
‘Sn’. For the numbering of each example, instead of using continuous numbers for the
examples throughout the thesis, the examples have been numbered for each chapter.
Some of the examples are presented more than once for discussion of different points
throughout the thesis, and these are indicated as such.

Note that Chapter 4 is devoted to analysis and discussion of the survey results and
the data presentation in this chapter is different from that of the discourse analysis in
other chapters. The survey respondents’ comments are presented with their exact
wording in Romanised Japanese. Glossing for each word is not provided but I give
English translations of the entire comment. At the end of each extract, respondents’ ID
numbers are indicated as in 1 to 428 (‘Respondent 1’ to ‘Respondent 428’).

1.5. Organisation of the study

This study comprises nine chapters and it is organised as follows. Following the current
Chapter 1, Chapter 2 reviews the previous literature on the use of anata and summarises
several distinct ways of viewing its use. Chapter 2 also points out issues with previous
accounts which have been accounted for by the current study.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of Japanese personal reference terms. This chapter
presents the basic rules of personal reference terms in Modern Japanese and also touches
on the history of anata. Further, the chapter provides explications of Japanese social
norms which are deeply tied to Japanese culture. The concept of ‘social norm’ is
particularly important for the analysis of the current study.

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the results of the self-reported native speakers’
survey on the use of anata. It first quantifies the relative use of anata by different age
groups and towards different addressees. It then describes and discusses the reasons for respondents’ choices and situations in which they would use the term. Respondents’ comments are also introduced and discussed. This chapter shows not only the frequency of the respondents’ use of *anata* but also reveals speakers’ differing rationales behind their particular choices. Awareness of these things contributes greatly to the discussion in the later discourse analysis.

Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to examining the functions and effects of the use of *anata* within the parameters of discourse analysis. The analysis in these chapters reveals that an indication of the degree of politeness and a speaker’s social elements are not genuine properties of *anata*. In fact, the use of *anata* specifies a second person without indicating any social elements of the interlocutors. I adopt the notion of ‘absolute specification’ of the second person to provide the framework for my analysis throughout the remainder of the study. Adopting this notion, Chapter 5 focuses on the use of *anata* when the interlocutors’ relationship is socially undefinable. On the other hand, Chapter 6 focuses on cases where a social relationship between the interlocutors is typically definable. I shall show that the inherent property of *anata* — absolute specification of the second person — is consistent in all cases except for a wife’s use of *anata* (as a special case), yet the use of the term functions in different ways by creating different expressive effects in different contexts.

Chapter 7 is a case study of the use of *anata* in parliamentary discourse. The reason this entire chapter focuses exclusively on parliamentary debate is that, unlike ordinary conversations, parliamentary debate has abundant examples of the use of *anata*. Functions clarified in Chapters 5 and 6 are attested to in the context of parliamentary
debate. The fact that this genre contains a higher frequency of occurrence of \textit{anata} comes to make sense during a reading of this chapter.

Chapter 8 discusses a social phenomenon regarding the use of \textit{anata} which occurred in Japan after \textit{anata} was defined as a ‘standard form’ of address in a language policy proposal soon after World War II. The chapter shows how established institutions, speakers’ identities/ideologies and socio-cultural norms interact with each other and go through a complex ‘reflexive process’ (Agha, 2007).

Much of the complexity of the ways in which language can clarify social relations for uses derives from the capacity of language users to acquire a reflexive grasp of particular aspects of a semiotic norm – \textit{what} the norm is, \textit{for whom} it is a norm, \textit{when} the norm applies, and so on – and to treat such a reflexive grasp as a subsequent basis for communicating messages, even when the message consists of the act of upholding a contrastive norm as a diacritic of self.

(Agha, 2007: 8)

Finally, Chapter 9 provides a summary of the findings of the study, implications and concluding remarks. Throughout the study, I search for a solution to the mystery of the word \textit{anata} ‘you’ in Japanese. In doing so, I shed some light on the nexus between language and culture.
Chapter 2
Literature review

2.1. Introduction

This chapter reviews the previous literature on the second person pronoun *anata* focusing on that which is deemed to be particularly noteworthy for our understanding of how this term has previously been considered. In the previous literature, analyses regarding the use of *anata* have tended to be partial and insufficient, for the following reasons. Firstly, scholars have tended to study the overall Japanese personal reference system as a whole and have only briefly discussed the use of *anata* as one of the various available second person pronouns and with very little analytical description (if any). As a result, the peculiarities of *anata* have been overlooked. Secondly, while there are studies which have focused specifically on the use of *anata* (Tani, 1981; Otaka, 1999; Kajiwara, 2004; Shimotani, 2012; Muramatsu and Xie, 2015), these studies examined only partial aspects of the use of *anata*. A full analysis of *anata* including its primary properties, the perceptions of native speakers of Japanese about its use, and its pragmatic effects, has not previously been undertaken.

In this chapter, I divide the previous studies into categories based on their different approaches. They are roughly categorised into four groups: (i) formality ranking-based approach, (ii) sociolinguistic approach, (iii) deixis-based approach and (iv) cognitive
approach. I will discuss each approach in detail in Sections 2.2 to 2.5 respectively. Section 2.6 is a summary of the chapter.

2.2. Formality ranking-based approach

Some studies have discussed the term anata based on its degree of formality in comparison to other address pronouns, such as kimi, omae and anta. Below is a summary of the research in this group.


In these studies, it is common to locate each pronoun in a formality ranking in a pronominal inventory. When ordered according to the formality ranking, anata is normally placed as the most formal second person pronoun, as shown in the following table extracted from Shibatani (1990: 371).

9 There are some other previous studies which touch on the use of anata (e.g. Suzuki, 1972; Araki, 1990; Onishi, 1992; Takahara, 1992; Jung, 1999; Saito, 1999; Lee and Yonezawa, 2008; Shu, 2008; Yokotani and Hasegawa, 2010a, 2010b; Maynard, 2001b; Kim, 2012). I did not include them in the current literature review because, although these studies made some comments about the use of anata, their focuses were not on the investigation of properties of anata (e.g. the contrastive study of personal reference terms in English and Japanese (Suzuki, 1982; Saito, 1999), the reflection of family nicknames on a family relationship (Yokotani and Hasegawa, 2010a), the effect of the overt use of first and second person reference terms (Lee and Yonezawa, 2008), the use of anata in textbooks published in Japan and China (Shu, 2008).

Also, there are diachronic studies which include a discussion of the history of anata (e.g. Sakuma, 1959; Tsujimura, 1968; Kojima, 1974; Komatsu, 1996; Hashiguchi, 1998; Ri, 2002; Barke and Uehara, 2005; Ishiyama, 2008, 2012). However, a diachronic investigation of anata is beyond the scope of this study, thus these studies are also not included here. That said, an overview of the history of anata will be discussed in Chapter 3 since it is relevant background knowledge.

10 Among the listed studies, Ide (1990b, 1992b) and Kanamaru (1997) are sociolinguistic studies. However, the reason that I have categorised them into the formality ranking-based approach rather than the sociolinguistic approach is that their treatment of anata is clearly based on the premise that anata is a formal second person pronoun.
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(1) Inventory of Japanese personal pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st person</th>
<th>2nd person</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male speaker</td>
<td>Female speaker</td>
<td>Male speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>anata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>kimi/anta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boku</td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>omae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ore</td>
<td>atashi</td>
<td>anta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shibatani (1990: 371)

In the above inventory, Shibatani (1990) ranks anata at the same level of formality as the first person pronoun watakushi ‘I’. Watakushi is the most formal first person form, used in highly formal settings such as job interviews and public speeches and so forth. Although some scholars place anata as slightly less formal, i.e. closer to the level of the first person watashi, the fact that anata is the most formal second person pronoun relative to other commonly used items is widely accepted.

As such, studies using the formality ranking-based approach tend to view anata as a formal second person pronoun or point out its entailment of a polite nuance. For example, Kanamaru (1997: 17) states that anata wa danjo kyootsuu ni foomaru na

---

11 The title of the table in Shibatani (1990: 371) is “Gender distinction in pronominal forms” as the purpose of this inventory in his work was mainly to discuss gender differences in the use of personal pronouns.

12 That said, Shibatani (1990) mentioned the restriction of the use of anata towards a superior. The statement is inconsistent with his placing anata as the most formal second person pronoun. This in fact suggests issues with the pronominal inventory which places anata in terms of its degree of formality.
bamen de mochiirareru ‘anata is used by both male and female speakers in formal situations’. It is the fact that the use of anata is observed in highly formal settings co-occurring with a high level of honorifics, such as official ceremonies, courtrooms, and parliamentary meetings. It is also observed in some written forms such as official letters and survey papers to address the reader in an official manner. In these settings, other second person pronouns such as kimi and omae would not be used as they are too informal and hence thought to be inappropriate.

The notion that anata is a formal second person pronoun has served to account for its distancing nuance. Ide (2006: 124) states that anata entails a sense of aratamari ‘formality’ and hence is interpreted as distancing the addressee. Sanada (1997) also states that the use of anata appears when interlocutors are not close enough, for example not knowing much about each other’s background. This is because anata is yaya teinei na a ‘relatively formal’ pronoun which functions to keep a certain distance between interlocutors. Sanada (1997) also states that this formality of anata makes it possible for its use to occur in a conflict situation in order to push the addressee to a distance. This account based on formality, however, is not adequate as will be shown in example (2) in this section.

Anata as a formal second person pronoun has also served to account for women’s use of the term. Some studies have stated that women tend to use anata more often than men and have attempted to explain this in relation to women’s polite use of language (Lee, 1976; Tani, 1981; Ide, 1990b, 1992b). It has been known that female speech tends to be more polite than male speech and includes more honorific usages or polite alternatives in word choices (Lakoff, 1973b; Ogino, 1981; Ide, 1982, 1990b, 1992b; Masuoka and Takubo, 1992; Shibamoto-Smith, 2003; Endo, 2006). The higher degree
of politeness in Japanese women’s speech has been said to be due to ‘men’s dominance over women in social positions’ in a ‘legacy of feudalism’ (Ide, 1982: 378).\textsuperscript{13}

However, placing \textit{anata} at the top of the formality ranking and treating it as a formal or polite second person reference term encounters problems upon further analysis. There are cases that this account does not manage, i.e. cases where the term is used in an impolite manner such as in an argument. As will be shown in Chapters 6 and 7, the use of \textit{anata} is often observed in conflict situations between interlocutors, such as a speaker’s emotional attack on an addressee. Observe the following example.

(2) A: \textit{Nani o itteru n desu ka, anata wa!}  
My OBJ is.saying NOM BE QUE 2PP: anata TOP  
\textit{Neboketa yoona koto o!}  
half.asleep like thing OBJ  
‘What are you (anata) talking about, such half asleep nonsense?!’  
(Committee meeting for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries: 08/11/2012)

The above example (2) is extracted from a parliamentary debate in Japan. In this example, the speaker is a member of parliament and the addressee is a parliamentary secretary. Here, it is true that \textit{anata} is used in a ‘formal’ setting, i.e. a parliamentary meeting. However, it is difficult to regard this occurrence of \textit{anata} as a high level of polite use of the term. On the contrary, the speaker is extremely angry and attacking the addressee almost as if he is picking a fight with the

\textsuperscript{13} This is said to be based on the concepts \textit{otoko-rashisa} ‘manliness’ and \textit{onna-rashisa} ‘womanliness’, the emergence of which are retrospective to the Meiji era (especially from the late 19th century to the early 20th century) when Japan’s modern nation-state formation was pursued (Falconer, 1984; Reynolds, 1990; Suzuki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1992; Okamoto, 1997; Shibamoto-Smith, 2003; Inoue, 2004, 2006; Endo, 2006). I will discuss this topic in Chapter 8.
addressee. He also hurls an abusive expression *neboketa yoona koto* ‘half asleep nonsense’. In such a situation, native speakers would sense a highly impolite nuance entailed by the use of *anata*.

Second, relating women’s use of *anata* to their employment of a ‘polite’ use of language also has a problem. The native speakers’ self-reported survey, which will be discussed in Chapter 4, shows that female native speakers are aware of the impolite nuance entailed by the use of *anata* and they do not rationalise their use of the term based on women’s politer use of language. In other words, this somewhat ‘popular’ accounting for women’s use of *anata* as a polite address term towards men does not have convincing evidence.

In short, an account based on the formality ranking of the pronoun inventory only focuses on partial aspects of the use of *anata* and tends to lack empirical investigation of the variety of uses of the term. As a result, it fails to systematically explain different observed cases of its use.

### 2.3. Sociolinguistic approach

There are some studies which focus primarily on the socio-cultural aspects of the use of personal reference terms. I categorise those studies into the ‘sociolinguistic approach’.

A summary of these studies is provided below, starting with a list of known studies, which consists of:

Suzuki (1973) clarified the socio-cultural rules of the system of Japanese personal reference terms, reflecting the importance of vertical relationships in the use of the terms. For example, within a family, a speaker normally uses kinship terms to address older members of the family. In other social situations outside the family, it is usual to refer to a superior addressee, for example, a teacher or boss, with occupational terms and position names, such as sensei ‘teacher’ and kachoo ‘section manager’. While a socially superior speaker can refer to an inferior addressee using names and pronouns, the reverse is not possible. Suzuki (1973: 155) states as follows.

[U]nder normal circumstances, one cannot call one’s teacher or boss by personal pronouns such as anata ‘you’. One may say to one’s teacher Sensei no okusama okagen ikaga desu ka, lit., ‘How is Teacher’s wife?’ to mean ‘How is your wife?’ But it is improper to ask Anata no okusama..., lit., ‘How is your wife?’ On the other hand, it is perfectly all right for a boss to ask a subordinate Kimi no okusan yoku natta ka ne ‘Is your wife feeling better?’


In doing this, Suzuki (1973) offers basic rules, the key point of which is that a socially inferior speaker cannot use second person pronouns to refer to a superior addressee (see Chapter 3 for further explanation). This rule has generally been regarded as the social norm of the personal reference system in Modern Japanese.

Based on Suzuki’s work, subsequent sociolinguistic studies of personal reference terms added detailed findings relevant to specific focus groups which attested to the rules, by means of surveys collected from native speakers. The contribution of these studies (which I have listed at the beginning of this section) has been to present some quantitative facts about native speakers’ self-reported usages. Extracting from these
studies and focusing on the use of *anata*, their main findings are summarised by the following three points.

Firstly, in line with my own findings (see Chapter 4 for details), the use of *anata* among present-day speakers of Japanese is reported to be infrequent. This has been shown in survey results of university students (Otaka, 1999), the workplace (Yoneda, 1990) and families (Spehri Badi, 2011, 2012, 2013).\(^\text{14}\)

Secondly, some studies reported that women tend to use *anata* more frequently than men or they are perceived to do so. For example, Jung (2003) reported on native speakers’ acceptability judgements regarding the use of *kimi* and *anata*. According to her, in situations where native speakers think that the use of *kimi* is acceptable by a male speaker, the use of *anata* is regarded as more appropriate than *kimi* if the speaker is female. Spehri Badi (2011, 2012, 2013) reported that mothers and grandmothers use *anata* more frequently than do fathers and grandfathers when addressing their children and grandchildren.

Thirdly, these survey results generally support the norm of the Japanese personal reference system clarified by Suzuki (1973), that is, an inferior speaker uses titles, occupational terms and kinship terms when referring to a superior addressee and does not use personal pronouns.\(^\text{15}\) That said, there are several studies which also admit that

---

\(^{14}\) Jung’s (2003) survey was based on native speakers’ acceptability judgements, thus, the frequency is not necessarily indicated by native speaker’s self-reported usages. However, she also included quantitative results by examining the frequency of personal pronouns observed in movie scripts published during the 1990s. These results show an infrequent use of *anata* in these materials compared to previous eras.

\(^{15}\) Jung’s (2003) study is not applicable to this comment as her quantitative results about the frequency of the use of personal reference terms in movie scripts did not record the relationship between the interlocutors. As for native speaker’s acceptability judgements, only a few situations were given in which the address terms were used. Thus, it is difficult to generalise her findings. These things actually indicate the shortcomings of Jung’s (2003) work as a piece of sociolinguistic research.
deviations from the norm may be observed. For example, Spehri Badi (2011, 2012, 2013) reported a deviation from Suzuki (1973), namely, younger siblings reported that they would use not only kinship terms such as oniichan ‘older brother’ and oneechan ‘older sister’ but also names and personal pronouns including anta, anata and omae towards older siblings. Spehri Badi (2013) explained this tendency based on an increase in the number of nuclear families and decrease in the number of siblings, which result in there being fewer siblings separated by a large age gap. Spehri Badi’s (ibid) interpretation of this was that siblings were less conscious of a junior and senior difference.

As seen thus far, these surveys give us some useful information regarding native speakers’ reflections on the use of anata. However, there are also shortcomings in the analysis of the term anata. One of them is that these surveys tend to be quite descriptive in demonstrating the results using numbers but lack any in-depth discussion about the cause of the results. For example, Spehri Badi’s (2013) finding is interesting in the sense that it shows a deviation from the norm, i.e. younger siblings may use anata towards older siblings. However, it is not clear from her study if they always do so or if there are any situational/contextual tendencies. Also, respondents’ meta-linguistic reflections are not included, thus the reasons for their choices are not known.

These issues arise because none of these surveys utilised mixed-method techniques, such as follow-up interviews, free commentary on the survey papers, or discourse analysis. As a result, it is difficult to know the reasons behind a particular respondent’s choice or avoidance of the use of anata towards a particular addressee.

Another shortcoming of these studies is that each survey has its own focus, hence the types of respondents and the investigated usages in these studies represent only
partial aspects of the use of *anata*. For example, Yoneda’s surveys were about the use of personal reference terms in a workplace (1990). Spehri Badi (2011, 2012, 2013) focused on usages of personal reference terms in families. Otaka’s survey (1999) was conducted only among university students in the Kansai region which has a distinct dialect, hence the responses may have been affected by the dialect. Thus, a generalisation of their findings is not possible.

Further, because of the quantitatively descriptive nature of these studies, one important question for the current study in relation to the social norm as presented by Suzuki (1973) was not inquired into. Suzuki (1973) stated the social norm that an inferior speaker cannot use personal pronouns towards a superior addressee, including the use of *anata*. However, research conducted within the sociolinguistic did not make clear what it was about the nature of *anata* that made its use towards a superior addressee impossible, despite the fact that *anata* is regarded as the most formal second person pronoun. On this point, Suzuki himself made the following comment.

*Ippanni, ‘anata’ wa ‘kimi’ ‘omae’ ‘kisama’ nado ni kurabete, keigo to made ikazutomo, hin no yoi kotoba to uketorarete iru nimo kakawarazu, jissaini wa meue ni mukatte tsukainikui kotoba nano dearu.*

Despite the fact that *anata* is generally considered a more polite word (though not part of *keigo* ‘honorific language’) than *kimi, omae*, and *kisama* (all of which are different ways of saying *you*), it is really a word not easily used when addressing persons of higher status.


In making this comment, Suzuki briefly mentioned that the use of *anata* would place the interlocutor at a distance but did not investigate further. In fact, the purpose of
Suzuki’s (1973) work was to show socio-cultural norms throughout the entire system of personal reference terms, so despite its insightful contribution, it tends to be prescriptive and does not investigate different usages and the logic behind them. Put differently, Suzuki’s rules do not answer such questions as why one cannot use personal pronouns, including *anata*, to refer to a superior addressee, and why there are some cases where a speaker’s use of personal reference terms deviates from the norm. In this sense, for the specific purpose of the current study, Suzuki’s (1973) study does not provide sufficient explanation to deal with the diverse aspects of the use of *anata*.

That said, it should be noted that Suzuki’s (1973) rule is important for the current study as essential background knowledge. For this reason, I provide details of it in Chapter 3.

Here, I have discussed studies that have used a sociolinguistic approach. Given the shortcomings of this approach which I have discussed above, it is fair to say that a comprehensive understanding of the use of *anata* was not an objective of these studies. In other words, none of these studies is sufficient if the objective is to discover the inherent properties of *anata* and its use. The sociolinguistic approach is only partially useful in aiding an understanding of the use of *anata* and has limited usefulness in a systematic analysis of the term.

### 2.4. Deixis-based approach

Some studies account for the use of *anata* from the ‘deixis’ point of view. These studies include:

I call these studies the ‘deixis-based approach’ because they account for interpretations of the use of anata based on the notion of deixis. Deixis refers to words and phrases which require contextual information in order to understand what they refer to, such as I and you (person deixis), here and there (spatial deixis), and so forth.\(^\text{16}\) The distinctive feature of first person and second person which separates these roles from third person is the fact that first and second person are inherently deictic in the above sense, while third person is not. Third person is not a participant in a conversational situation and does not play a speech role. Thus, the third person is in a non-deictic category (Halliday and Hasan, 1976; Levinson, 1983, 2004; Siewierska, 2004).

The key point here that is emphasised by the deixis-based approach is the directness of the use of anata caused by its deictic nature as a second person pronoun. This approach fundamentally views the use of anata as impolite when used towards a superior and attempts to explain the reason. In this sense, it is the deixis-based approach that has tried to solve the question raised out of Suzuki’s (1973) work mentioned in the previous section, namely, why anata cannot be used towards a superior addressee.

Kanai (2003a: 14) extracts the following example from a novel.

\[
\text{(3) Kato: } \begin{array}{llllllll}
\text{Ittai} & \text{anata} & \text{wa} & \text{naze} & \text{watashi ni} & \text{sonna} & \text{koto} & \text{o} \\
\text{at.all} & \text{2PP: anata} & \text{TOP} & \text{why} & \text{1PP} & \text{DAT} & \text{such} & \text{thing} & \text{OBJ}
\end{array}
\]

\(^{16}\) Levinson (2004) classifies the semantic field of deixis into five categories: (i) person deixis, (ii) time deixis, (iii) spatial deixis, (iv) discourse deixis, and (v) social deixis. He claims that these categories are universal, while their expression in grammatical categories is diverse across languages. Put differently, “deictic categories have a universality independent of their grammatical expression — they will all be reflected somewhere in grammar or lexis” (Levinson, 2004: 112).
“Why do you (anata) ask me such a thing?”

Kagemura: Anata da to?

2PP: anata BE QT

“You (anata)?”

(Narration) Kagemura wa mutto shita yoo na kao de itta.

‘Kagemura said, as if he were in a bad temper.’


Kagemura is a teacher and Kato is his student. When Kato uses anata towards his teacher Kagemura, the teacher gets offended and this is seen in the narration. Kanai (2003a) states that the use of anata inevitably entails an impolite nuance because of the directness caused by its deictic nature. He states that other personal reference terms such as occupational terms and name and suffixes function to avoid such directness. For more detailed analysis on this point, Takubo’s (1997) study is useful.

Takubo (1997) claims that among various personal reference terms in Japanese, only personal pronouns are inherently deictic. To explain this point, Takubo (1997) divided personal reference terms in Japanese into three categories. The first category is ninshoo meishi (lit. ‘person nouns’) such as watashi ‘I’ and anata ‘you’. Ninshoo

---

17 Takubo (1997) argues that in Japanese, words such as watashi ‘I’ and anata ‘you’ indicate person referents, but do not indicate a grammatical person category as a cross-reference system. These terms are interchangeable with other nouns. Thus, he argues that words like watashi and anata do not have to be exclusively categorised as daimeishi ‘pronouns’ but can be simply regarded as a type of meishi ‘nouns’. Although Takubo (1997) does not use the word ninshoo daimeishi ‘personal pronouns’, what he means can be regarded as personal pronouns in a general sense. I will use the term personal pronouns hereafter to refer to (in Takubo’s words) ninshoo meishi.
meishi change their referent when the role of the speaker and the addressee changes. The second category is teikijutsu (lit. ‘fixed descriptive word’), which includes words such as position titles and kinship terms, e.g. kachoo ‘section manager’, otoosan ‘father’ and so forth. According to Takubo, words such as kachoo and otoosan merely refer to these roles in the immediate conversational situation, not primarily referring to the speaker and the listener. When those who have roles such as ‘father’ and ‘teacher’ in the immediate situation happen to be the speaker or the listener, the teikijutsu are used as first or second person reference terms. In this sense, teikijutsu do not fundamentally indicate speech roles. The third category is koyuumeishi ‘proper names’. Proper names are also given to a referent initially and the speech roles are added later only in the conversational situation.

Takubo (1997) claims that among all these words, only personal pronouns are deictic in the sense that their referent is provided only by the context, not by ‘the semantic conditions imposed by the expression’ (Levinson, 2004: 101).

Takubo (1997) explains that the reason for the inappropriateness of using personal pronouns towards a superior addressee in Japanese communication comes from their deictic nature. That is, the role of the listener is directly assigned to the addressee by the speaker in the immediate context. According to him, this means that the use of personal pronouns lacks an indirect politeness strategy. Other terms such as teikijutsu (e.g. otoosan ‘father’ and sensei ‘teacher’) and koyuumeishi (e.g. Tanaka-san ‘Mr. Tanaka’) can avoid this directness, fundamentally because these terms are socially determined descriptions, not directly assigned by the speaker in the conversational context.

To explain this concept metaphorically, Miwa (2005) and Kanai (2012) state that the use of second person pronouns is as if the speaker directly points to the addressee
with his/her finger, hence it is felt to be impolite. Kanai (2012) connects the deictic nature of the use of second person pronouns to a philosophical concept proposed by the philosopher Ortega (1963 [1957]), that the overt use of personal pronouns has a fundamentally violent nature as it directly assigns the addressee only in the immediate context (Ortega, 1963 [1957]). Ortega also metaphorically expresses the point by stating that it is almost like shooting a bullet from the speaker’s mind towards the addressee.

The notion of directness inherent in the use of personal pronouns due to their deictic nature captures an important aspect of personal pronouns. It serves to make sense of the infeasibility of using personal pronouns towards a superior in Japanese communication, where indirectness is an important part of politeness (Araki, 2003; Miwa, 2005). However, when focusing on the use of anata, there are some shortcomings with an account based on deixis.

First, this approach is primarily concerned with the entire group of personal pronouns, hence various terms such as anata, kimi, omae and kisama are classified into a single category as ‘second person pronouns’ and simultaneously ‘deixis’. This classification fails to provide a detailed discussion of each form. In other words, the detailed functions of various second person pronouns, including anata, are not sufficiently described even though they have very different properties. Observe the following examples.

\[(4) \quad ?Watashi \quad wa \quad kisama \quad o \quad aishiteimasu.\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1PP & TOP & 2PP: kisama & OBJ \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I love you (kisama).’

\[(5) \quad Watashi \quad wa \quad anata \quad o \quad aishiteimasu.\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1PP & TOP & 2PP: anata & OBJ \\
\end{array}
\]

‘I love you (anata).’
Example (4) uses *kisama* and (5) uses *anata* to refer to the addressee. As briefly mentioned in Chapter 1 and noted in Section 2.2 of this chapter, different address pronouns indicate different social information about the interlocutors. *Kisama* is a derogatory form of second person pronoun predominantly used by male speakers and expresses a strong sense of contempt, hence is only used in limited situations such as emotional conflict (Ishiyama, 2008: 3). When *kisama* is used with a polite form of the intimate expression *aishiteimasu* ‘love’, the sentence (4) sounds odd and inappropriate in normal circumstances. On the other hand, the use of *anata* in the sentence (5) can comfortably co-occur with formal form of the verb ‘love’ and the sentence expresses a sincere nuance. Differences such as the ones shown in examples (4) and (5) are overlooked if we discuss all personal pronouns as one category of second person pronouns.

Second, the deixis-based approach tends to focus only on the impossibility of the use of second person pronouns, including *anata*, towards a superior addressee. Examples (2) in section 2.2 and (3) in this section are indeed interpreted as impolite and not appropriate in normal circumstances. However, there are cases where the use of *anata* does not necessarily entail an impolite nuance. Observe the following example.

(6) M: Anata wa anata no yarikata de hisshini kazoku
2PP: anata TOP 2PP: anata LK way by earnestly family
o aishiteita dake desu.
OBJ loved only BE
‘You (anata) loved (your) family in your (anata) own way, that’s all.’

(Kaseifu no Mita, 8)
The above example (6) is an extract from the drama *Kaseifu no Mita* ‘Housekeeper Mita’ from the data set. The housekeeper Mita is working for a family of five, a father Keiichi and his four children. The above extract is from a conversation between Keiichi’s father-in-law Yoshiyuki and the housekeeper Mita. Yoshiyuki is a stubborn person, which Yoshiyuki himself is aware of. Yoshiyuki’s wife passed away earlier and his daughter killed herself. He has been blaming himself for not being able to protect them. He regretted that his stubborn personality made him look a cold person as a husband and a father. He felt that his personality was partly responsible for the death of his wife and daughter. In example (6), the housekeeper Mita, who is much younger than Yoshiyuki, tries to defend him, saying that Yoshiyuki indeed loved his family in his own way. As a social norm, the use of anata from a housekeeper in her 30’s towards her master’s father-in-law in his 60’s would be regarded as inappropriate. However, Mita’s utterance in this case does not carry an impolite nuance. Instead, it has a sincere tone and the speaker’s message is felt to be straightforward and honest.

In fact, returning to the previous example (5), even if the speaker is an inferior talking to a superior addressee, it is difficult to say that this use of anata is impolite. Native speakers of Japanese would intuitively agree with the perception that it may not be impolite. As will be discussed in Chapter 6, the use of anata appears in sincere messages, love songs and poems in which it conveys a cordial message regardless of the addressee’s social relationship.

As such, the deixis-based approach has limitations in explaining different aspects of anata in a systematic manner. While this approach makes sense of generally accepted social norms regarding the use of personal reference terms in Japanese (i.e. the inferior should not use personal pronouns towards the superior), it cannot explain counter cases.
Its account has difficulty explaining why the use of anata is in fact observed in utterances towards a superior addressee and why its use is not always interpreted as impolite.

2.5. Cognitive approach

In this section, I will discuss the cognitive approach. This approach takes a different standpoint from the three approaches described previously in the sense that the concept of ‘superiority’ or ‘inferiority’ and distance between the interlocutors is not based on actual social factors but on cognitive factors. Two studies are found to belong to this group.

Shimotani (2012), Muramatsu and Xie (2015)

Shimotani (2012) examines the use of anata in relation to the notion of ‘epistemic primacy’, which was developed by Stivers et al. (2011). Stivers et al. define epistemic primacy as follows:

In social interaction people orient to asymmetries in their relative rights to know about some state of affairs (access) as well as their relative rights to tell, inform, assert or assess something, and asymmetries in the depth, specificity or completeness of their knowledge. This asymmetry can be termed epistemic primacy.

(Stivers et. al. 2011: 13)

Shimotani (2012) argues that the use of anata occurs when the speaker has epistemic primacy in relation to the addressee. Observe the following example from Shimotani (2012: 73), which is extracted from a documentary movie Senkyo ‘Election’. In this
extract, a candidate of a political party is giving a speech to residents on the street. A woman approaches the candidate and speaks to him.

(7) Woman:  **Anata no, koo, keireki mitara mada**  
2PP:  *anata*  LK  FL  career.history  look-CD  yet  
zenzen...  
at.all...  
‘If (I) look at **your (anata no)** career history, not yet at all…’

Candidate:  **Soo desu ne, watashi ne...**  
that’s.right  SFP  IPP  SFP  
‘That’s right, I…’

Woman:  **Koko ni wa tsukushitenai.**  
Here  DAT  TOP  have.not.contributed  
‘(You) haven’t contributed to this district yet.’

(Shimotani, 2012: 72)

Preceding this extract, the woman, who is a voter in the area, stated to the candidate that other candidates had already tried their best to contribute to the district. Then, in this example, the woman points out that the candidate has not yet really done so. Shimotani (2012) argues that the use of *anata* here by the woman is a device used to express that she is a voter and hence is in a position to give her judgment and evaluation of the candidate. In other words, this woman is regarded as possessing an epistemic primacy and hence is entitled to use *anata*.

Shimotani (2012) goes on to argue that this notion explains why the use of *anata* is often observed in court cases. In a court, *anata* is frequently used by judges and
lawyers toward the accused. According to Shimotani (2012), this is because judges and lawyers are naturally supposed to possess epistemic primacy, as they are professionals in judging and assessing the accused. Such epistemic primacy, that is, the possession of knowledge and experience, often co-exists with the actual social status of the owner of the epistemic primacy. Thus, it is often the case that a socially higher status speaker uses *anata* towards an inferior addressee. However, when the actual position and the possession of epistemic primacy is not congruent, the inferior’s use of *anata* towards the superior addressee is possible (Shimotani, 2012).

Similarly, Muramatsu and Xie (2015) state that *anata* tends to be used when the speaker ‘thinks’ that he/she is superior to the addressee in terms of knowledge and experience. Apart from the superiority of knowledge, Muramatsu and Xie (2015) further state that when *anata* is used, it always provides a certain level of psychological distance of the speaker from the addressee.

The cognitive approach is innovative in the sense that it analyses the relationship between the use of *anata* and the speaker’s epistemic stance rather than the actual social relationship. Whereas other approaches previously discussed build their analysis on the scaffold of the actual social relationship between the interlocutors, the cognitive approach is based on the asymmetry of the interlocutor’s epistemic status or psychological distance.

However, if we look at various uses of *anata*, the cognitive approach also encounters some problems. For example, Shimotani (2012) only examines cases where the speaker has epistemic primacy, namely, the superiority of knowledge. This creates a limitation in explaining other cases. As mentioned in section 2.2, *anata* often appears in
certain materials such as questionnaires. Observe the following example from an online market research questionnaire (Myvoice.co.jp, 2010).

(8) **Anata ga fudan riyoosuru famiriir resutoran wa doko**

2PP: anata SBJ usually use family restaurant TOP where
desu ka.

BE QUE

‘Which family restaurant do **you (anata)** usually use?’

(Myvoice.co.jp, 2010)

The use of *anata* in asking questions to respondents as in the example above is very common in Japanese questionnaires. Fundamentally, the nature of a questionnaire is to ask what the investigator ‘does not know’. In this sense, it is difficult to view the use of *anata* as the indication of the speaker’s epistemic primacy. It is also difficult to interpret the use of *anata* in this example in the way Shimotani (2012: 90) has claimed as *anata*’s entailment *uekara mesen* ‘looking down from above’.

Shimotani (2012) also states that when possessing epistemic primacy, the speaker’s implicit claim is that the utterance is based on factual information. Thus, the speaker employs expressions which show higher evidentiality and objectivity. According to her, *anata* tends to co-occur with these expressions. Thus, the use of *anata* tends to sound cold, intimidating and distancing.

Muramatsu and Xie (2015) state that the use of *anata* occurs when the speaker has a psychological distance from the addressee. This gives *anata* an unemotional tone. They state as follows.

_Hanashite ga aite ni taishite ‘anata’ o shiyoo suru baai ni wa, hanashite wa aite ni taishite jibun no kanjoo o osaete sessuru._

48
When the speaker uses *anata* to the addressee, the speaker interacts with the addressee with control of his/her emotion.

(Muramatsu and Xie, 2015: 134)

However, in the data of the current study, the use of *anata* was often observed in highly spontaneous emotional utterances. I restate the earlier example (2) as (2)’ here.

(2)’ A: *Nani o itteru n desu ka, anata wa!*  
*what OBJ is.saying NOM BE QUE 2PP: anata TOP*  
*Neboketa yoona koto o!*  
*half.asleep like thing OBJ*  
‘What are you (*anata*) talking about, such half asleep nonsense?!’

(Committee meeting for agriculture, forestry and fisheries: 08/11/2012)

As we can see, the above utterance in (2)’ is a momentary explosion of the speaker’s emotion. It is difficult to see this utterance as holding high evidentially and objectivity or as the speaker having control of his emotion.

In terms of its entailed nuance, there are some differences between the two studies. On the one hand, Shimotani (2012) tends to examine cases where the use of *anata* is fundamentally interpreted as ‘threatening to the addressee’s face’ (Brown and Levinson, 1987) by focusing on the speaker’s possession of epistemic primacy. This leads her to claim that the use of *anata* inevitably entails a coercive and cold and hence somewhat impolite nuance. Thus, similar to the deixis-based approach, Shimotani’s (2012) account has difficulty in explaining any use of *anata* which entails a polite and sincere nuance (cf. example (8) above).

On the other hand, Muramatsu and Xie (2015) state that although *anata* is similar to English *you* and Chinese *ni*, it has a more formal nuance than *you* and *ni*. According
to them, this formal nuance indicates that the speaker has a certain level of respect towards the addressee. This is the reason that *anata* is used when the speaker has some psychological distance from the addressee as well as when the speaker is controlling his emotion. Thus, similar to the formality-based approach, Muramatsu and Xie’s (2015) account has difficulty in explaining cases such as a speaker’s emotional explosion or his/her disrespectful utterance towards the addressee (cf. example (2) above).

In short, it can be said that the cognitive approach also only focuses on partial aspects of the use of *anata*. As a result, it fails to systematically explain the core function of the use of *anata*. As shown here, there are cases which this account is not able to consistently and systematically explain. This suggests that the indication of epistemic primacy or psychological distance is not a genuine property of *anata*.

### 2.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have provided an overview of how the use of *anata* has previously been analysed in the literature of Japanese linguistics. While the previous studies give us insights into *anata*’s usages, due to their focus only on partial aspects of the use of the term, their account is incapable of identifying the inherent nature of *anata* systematically and sufficiently.

Throughout this study, I attempt to fill this gap, offering an integrated analysis of the functions of the use of *anata* which comprehensively accounts for the issues related to its use. As mentioned briefly in Chapter 1, this study will reveal that none of the views on *anata* in the previous literature, i.e. an indication of the degree of formality/politeness, epistemic primacy and psychological distance, pinpoints the genuine properties of *anata*. I adopt the notion of ‘absolute specification’ of the second person to provide the
framework for my analysis and I show that *anata* specifies the addressee without displaying any social elements of the interlocutors. The study then attempts to systematically explain the mechanisms that lead to *anata* having such a socially inert role, which in turn allows its use to occur in limited contexts and particular genres as well as to create disparate perceptions among native speakers. This ultimately reveals aspects of how a particular word interacts with culturally specific contexts and norms in a particular language.
Chapter 3

Japanese personal reference terms, social norms in Japan and the history of *anata*

3.1. Introduction

This chapter gives an overview of three important areas which are particularly relevant to the discussion of the use of *anata*. First, in Section 3.2, I outline commonly used personal reference terms in Modern Japanese and the overall system of their use. As briefly discussed in Chapter 2, Japanese personal reference terms follow general pragmatic rules that have been clarified in a fairly systematic way (Suzuki, 1973). Awareness of expectations about the appropriate use of these terms is very important for the later discussion on the use of *anata* in Chapters 4 to 8.

Second, in Section 3.3, I discuss the importance of common ground, that is, what are called ‘social norms’ in communication. I will start by touching on the general relationship between language and common ground in Section 3.3.1 and move onto a discussion of norms in Japanese communication. To discuss the norms of Japanese communication, it is important to consider the concept of ‘self’, that is, how ‘self’ is conceptually perceived in relation to the ‘other’ in Japanese culture. Section 3.3.2 will touch on this point. Another important aspect of the discussion of social norms relates to the basic structure of society. For this reason, Section 3.3.3 will address this aspect, focusing especially on the predominance of vertical relationships in Japanese society. In addition, understanding social norms necessarily requires an understanding of the notion
of politeness in society. Although politeness in language practice has been discussed as being universal in Brown and Levinson’s (1987) classic literature, it has also been argued that its universality is doubtful in different cultures, and the notion of politeness in various cultures must be accounted for by looking at characteristics of individual societies (Hill et al, 1986; Ide, 1989, 1992a, 2006, 2012; Matsumoto, 1988; Janney and Arndt, 1993; Watts, Ide and Ehlich, 1992; Foley, 1997). I discuss this point in 3.3.4, by adopting the notion of wakimae ‘discernment’ as proposed by Hill et al. (1986) and developed by Ide (1989, 1992a, 2006, 2012).

Third, Section 3.4 will take a look at the history of anata in relation to the degree of politeness the use of anata has entailed over time. This is because linguistic contention over the use of anata is partly related to the historical change in its pragmatic value. Section 3.4.1 covers the period within which anata was once demonstrative and then became semanticised later as a polite second person pronoun. Section 3.4.2 discusses the pragmatic depreciation of the use of anata, that is, its loss of a high degree of politeness. Section 3.5 gives a summary of the chapter.

3.2. Personal reference terms in Japanese

It is well known that Japanese is abundant in items of personal reference terms, the use of which is primarily determined by the social characteristics of the interlocutors, such as their age, gender and relative social status as well as the level of formality in a conversational setting (Sakuma, 1959; Kindaichi, 1959; Kurokawa, 1972; Martin, 1975; Suzuki, 1972, 1973, 1978, 1982; Okamoto, 1985; Shibatani, 1990; Ide, 1990a, 1990b, 2006; Onishi, 1992; Kanzaki, 1994; Kanamaru, 1997; Sanada, 1997; Jinnouchi, 1998; Otaka, 1999; Saito, 1999; Jung, 1999, 2003: Kajiwara, 2004; Shu, 2008; Maynard,
As mentioned in Chapter 2, Japanese has a rather complex system of first and second person pronouns. The following tables (1) and (2) are summaries of commonly used personal pronouns for the first and second person respectively. They are based on previous studies, Ide (1990b: 73), Maynard (2001b: 11), and Ishiyama (2008: 2), but with some modifications as stated below the tables.

(1) First person pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Female speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>watakushi</td>
<td>watakushi**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>watashi</td>
<td>watashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>boku (plain)*</td>
<td>watashi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ore (deprecatory)</td>
<td>atashi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Maynard (2001b) does not include watakushi for ‘frequently used personal pronouns’.

Watakushi is the most formal first person pronoun. It is typically used when a conversational situation is formal, for example, at an official speech or a job interview. In the case of watashi, there is an observable difference in the level of formality depending on whether this pronoun is used by men or women. Men’s use of watashi is
normally regarded as formal while women use *watashi* in both formal and casual contexts (Ide, 1990b; Maynard, 2001b). *Boku* is regarded as a ‘plain’ informal self-reference term for men while *ore* is an ‘informal’ or ‘deprecatory’ form, being seen as a display of masculinity (Okamoto, 1985; Ide, 1990b).¹⁸ Men often use *boku* or *ore* among friends, family and in other casual settings, while women normally use *watashi* or *atashi* in such cases.

(2) Second person pronouns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male addressee</th>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Female speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>N.A.*</td>
<td>N.A.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal</td>
<td><em>anata/kimi</em></td>
<td><em>anata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower</td>
<td><em>anta/omae</em></td>
<td><em>anata/kimi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kisama/temee</strong></td>
<td>(derogatory)***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Female addressee</th>
<th>Male speaker</th>
<th>Female speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>N.A.*</td>
<td>N.A.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal</td>
<td><em>kimi/anata</em></td>
<td><em>anata</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower</td>
<td><em>kimi</em></td>
<td><em>anata/anta</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N.A.*’ indicates that the second person pronoun is generally regarded as inappropriate in this case.

**Maynard (2001b) does not include *anata* between male speakers.

*** The description ‘derogatory’ for *kisama/temee* is from Ishiyama (2008). Ide (1990b) describes *omae* and *kisama* as ‘deprecatory’.

---

¹⁸ According to Ide (1990b), because men’s speech has an uninhibited quality, vulgar expressions do not have negative values and are favourably used by men. For detailed discussion of the gender differences in self-references, see Yoneda (1986), Ide (1990b) and Kanamaru (1997).
With second person pronouns, there are also a variety of items for use. Some studies treat *kimi* as a pronoun used exclusively by males (Kurokawa, 1972: 7; Ide, 1982: 359; Ide, 1990b: 73; Shibatani, 1990: 371), although a female speaker also uses *kimi* towards a socially inferior male addressee (Maynard, 2001b: 11; Jung, 2003: 37-53). That said, from a native speakers’ point of view, female speakers’ use of *kimi* is limited and less acceptable than male speakers’ usage (Jung, 2003: 53). *Omae* is predominantly used by male speakers to refer to an equal or an inferior. The mutual use of so-called ‘vulgar’ forms *ore* ‘I’ and *omae* ‘you’ is often observed in informal talk between male friends. *Temee* and *kisama* are regarded as derogatory forms. They can be typically observed in situations such as emotional conflict and express a strong sense of contempt (Ishiyama, 2008: 3).

*Anata* is not normally used when the addressee is of a superior social status (Suzuki, 1973, 1978; Takubo, 1997; Saito, 1999; Maynard, 2001b: Kanai, 2002, 2003a, 2003b, 2012; Araki, 2003; Miwa, 2005, 2010). As noted in Chapter 2, although some previous studies have claimed that *anata* is a formal second person pronoun, the restriction in its use towards a superior addressee has generally been regarded as a social norm of the Japanese personal reference system (Suzuki 1973). I will discuss Suzuki’s (1973) clarification later in this section.

The categories presented in Table (2) above (i.e. higher, equal, lower) as well as the next Table (3) below (i.e. intimate, non-intimate) remind us of Brown and Gilman’s (1960) classic literature regarding power and solidarity in the use of the European *T-V* system. In terms of power semantics, they state that power is nonreciprocal; “the

---

19 Onishi (1994: 363) states that the use of *omae* by an elderly woman towards young children may be observed. However, its use is not common and highly limited.
superior says $T$ and receives $V$” (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 255). As for solidarity semantics, they state “[t]he dimension of solidarity is potentially applicable to all persons addressed. Power superiors may be solidary (parents, elder siblings) or not solidary (officials whom one seldom sees). Power inferiors, similarly, may be as solidary as the old family retainer and as remote as the waiter in a strange restaurant” (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 258-259). The notion of Brown and Gilman’s (1960) European $T$-$V$ system is also useful for a discussion of the personal reference system in Japanese in the sense that dimensions in human relations, namely, power and solidarity, are indeed observed in Japanese communication as vertical and horizontal relations. However, in Japanese, there are various personal reference terms, each of which has different properties and it is not my intention to categorise these abundant items into $T$ or $V$.\(^{20}\)

Next, let us look at personal names, where there is also variety in the use of first name/last name and the appropriate suffixes. The use of these varieties is, again, determined by the interlocutors’ gender, social status and the level of formality in a conversational setting. Importantly, as briefly noted in Chapter 1, personal names are not only used as vocatives but also appear in a pronoun slot. For example, to say ‘is this your book?’ to a person called Noriko, Japanese uses a sentence like *Kore, Noriko-san*

---

\(^{20}\) Not categorising Japanese second person reference terms into $T$ or $V$ also means that I do not discuss whether *anata* is close to the $T$ form or $V$ form. Wierzbicka (1992: 320) states that “$T$ forms in different languages are semantically equivalent” and they are semantically more basic. Along with this, analysis of various Asian languages has stated that the ‘intimate’ or ‘low’ form is the most semantically basic (cf. Diller, 1994: 167-169 on Thai; Onishi, 1994: 362-366 in Japanese; Enfield, 2002: 147-149 on Lao). On the other hand, the $V$ form in Bogotá Spanish (in Colombian Spanish) *usted* has been found to possibly be semantically more basic (Travis, 2002: 177-183). Travis suggests the possibility of rejecting the claim that $T$ forms are semantically equivalent cross-linguistically (Wierzbicka, 1992: 320) and addresses the importance of pragmatics to definitions in the subject pronouns. In this study, I acknowledge that it is not my intention to discuss the semantic prime of ‘you’ in Japanese in terms of a NSM (Natural Semantic Metalanguage) framework.
no hon? ‘Is this Ms. Noriko’s (= your) book?’ The variety is summarised as follows.

Table (3) is based on Maynard (2001b:11).

(3) Use of L(ast) N(ame), F(irst) N(ame), and suffixes by gender, social status, and level of intimacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>male speaker</td>
<td>female speaker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not-intimate</td>
<td>intimate</td>
<td>not-intimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male addressee</td>
<td>LN-samal-san</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
<td>LN-samal-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female addressee</td>
<td>LN-samal-san</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
<td>LN-samal-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>higher</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
<td>FN(-chan)</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
<td>FN(-chan)</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>low</td>
<td>LN</td>
<td>FN(-chan)</td>
<td>LN-san</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Maynard, 2001b: 11)21

The most polite suffix –sama is conventionally used to address the recipient of a letter, or by an employee in a service industry (such as a shop or hotel) when addressing customers. The suffix –san is normally used for politeness while –chan or –kun can be used when the interlocutors are close (Bu, 2004: 317). The suffix –kun is mostly used to address a male equal or inferior. However, the male superior’s use of –kun towards a female inferior can be observed with an authoritative nuance. Females use –san more often even in an intimate relationship.

21 In this study, I use GN (Given Name) and FN (Family Name) throughout the thesis since FN (First Name) LN (Last Name) are not appropriate when applied to Japanese. Thanks go to an anonymous examiner for pointing this out.
There is also a variety of kinship terms used in a pronoun slot. As briefly shown in Chapter 2, Suzuki’s (1973) work is notable in capturing the systematic regulation of the person reference system in Modern Japanese. Looking at the use of kinship terms as shown in Suzuki (1973: 150), the following figure displays the status relationships within a Japanese family.

(4) The status relationship within a Japanese family

\[\text{(Suzuki, 1973:150)} \]^{22}

---

^{22} It should be noted that Suzuki’s (1973) figure has minor inaccuracies. First, the statement that the line in the figure divides the older and younger members of the extended family is not necessarily true since a wife may be older than ‘self’ (as with anesan-nyoogoo). Second, a mother can address her children as anata but in the diagram, she is below the line. I owe this observation with thanks to an anonymous examiner.
The line in the figure divides the older and younger members of the extended family.

The following four points made by Suzuki (1973: 151-152) are relevant for the current study.

(i) The speaker cannot use a personal pronoun to address a relative above the dividing line. For example, it is regarded as impossible for a son to address his father as *anata* ‘you’. In contrast, speakers above the line can use a personal pronoun to address any relative below the dividing line. For example, a grandmother can address her grandchildren as *anata* ‘you’.

(ii) The speaker normally uses kinship terms to address people above the dividing line. For example, grandchildren use *ojiisan* ‘grandfather’ to address their grandfather. On the other hand, kinship terms cannot be used to address relatives below the line. For example, one cannot use *otooto* ‘younger brother’ or *musume* ‘daughter’ to address his/her younger brother or daughter respectively.

(iii) The speaker cannot address a person above the line by name alone. However, it is permitted to address a person below the line by name only. For example, between a younger brother Taro and an older brother Ken, the younger brother cannot address his older brother as Ken but as *niisan* ‘older brother’. However, the older brother is allowed to address his younger brother as Taro.

(iv) The speaker can refer to himself/herself using kinship terms when talking to someone below the line but he/she cannot do so when talking to a person above the line. For example, in a conversation between an older brother and a younger brother, the former can refer to himself *niisan* ‘older brother’, but the latter cannot refer to himself *otooto* ‘younger brother’. Thus, in Japanese, words denoting
‘father’ ‘mother’ ‘grandfather’ ‘grandmother’ ‘uncle’ ‘aunt’ ‘older brother’ ‘older sister’ and so forth can serve as self-reference terms. However, words such as ‘child’ ‘grandchild’ ‘son’ ‘daughter’ ‘younger brother’ ‘younger sister’ cannot serve as self-reference terms.

It is important to emphasise here that, as also pointed out by Suzuki (1973: 154ff), the basic principle of the above rules may apply almost unchanged to social situations outside the family. The above rules (i)-(iv) can be paraphrased to apply outside the family as follows.

(i) One cannot use personal pronouns to address, for example, his/her own teacher or boss, that is, someone who is higher in social status. However, from the superior to the inferior, the personal pronoun can be used. For example, a teacher or boss can use personal pronouns towards his/her student or subordinate.

(ii) It is normal to address someone higher in social status using occupational terms and position names, such as sensei ‘teacher’ and kachoo ‘section manager’. On the other hand, the reverse is not possible. For example, a teacher cannot address students as seito ‘students’.

(iii) The speaker cannot address a person of a higher status by name alone without being accompanied by occupational terms or position terms. For example, an employee uses Yamada kachoo ‘section manager Yamada’ to address his/her manager Yamada. When one does not attach these terms to names, he/she should attach another appropriate suffix. However, it is permitted to address a person of lower status by name only.

(iv) People of higher status can sometimes address themselves by their titles when
talking to people of lower status, but the reverse is not possible. For example, a teacher can refer to him/herself as sensei ‘teacher’ when talking to his/her students, but students cannot call themselves seito ‘students’ when talking to their teacher.

Regarding the term sensei (lit. ‘teacher’), it is used not only to refer to an actual ‘teacher’ (i.e. one whose occupation is teaching), but also to refer to a medical doctor, a lawyer, a politician and other authoritative figures (Ide, 1982: 359, 2006: 73). Sensei is also traditionally used among teachers to address each other in a school setting regardless of age (Shigematsu, 1956: 108).

Given these general rules, let us look at an actual example of the use of personal reference terms. Figure (5) is from Suzuki (1973: 148) and in this case the central entity (i.e. ‘self’) is a speaker in his forties whose occupation is a primary school teacher.

(Suzuki, 1973: 148)
This figure shows that the same speaker uses different first and second person reference terms depending upon whom he is talking to. Regarding first person reference terms, the speaker uses the formal first person pronoun watakushi ‘I’ when talking to the principal and the plain casual form boku ‘I’ when talking to his father, his older brother and his colleagues. He uses the vulgar first person pronoun ore ‘I’ when talking to his wife. In addition to these terms, he uses kinship terms and occupational terms. To his son, he uses otoosan ‘father’, to his neighbour’s son, ojisan ‘uncle’23, to his students, sensei ‘teacher’, and to his younger brother, niisan ‘older brother’. As for second person reference terms, the speaker also uses a variety of terms depending on the addressee. He refers to older members of his family with kinship terms such as otoosan ‘father’ and niisan ‘older brother’. Towards his superiors at work, he uses occupational terms koochoo sensei ‘principal’ or sensei ‘teacher’. He refers to his wife, his son and his younger brother as omae ‘you’. When he calls his students, he uses the students’ names.

As for anata, while the example above indicates that the speaker uses it towards his colleagues at an equal level, the self-reported survey of a large number of native speakers, undertaken as part of the current study, reveals that this usage is not in fact perceived to be common. I will discuss this in Chapter 4.

Thus far, we have observed a variety of first and second person reference terms and how these terms are generally used in Japanese. In the general rules given above, there are two important points that need to be addressed for the discussion of the current study.

23 Suzuki (1973) pointed out that Japanese has a ‘fictive use’ of kinship terms. That is, children or young speakers may use kinship terms such as ojisan ‘uncle’ and obasan ‘aunt’ to refer to middle-aged addressees. Further, middle-aged speakers can refer to themselves in this way when talking to children or young addressees.
First, the overt use of any Japanese personal reference terms inevitably acknowledges the relative social relationship between the speaker and the addressee. As Suzuki (1973) states, the speaker’s choice of a Japanese personal reference term is fundamentally based on the presence of the addressee. As shown above, the man in Figure (5) calls himself otoosan ‘father’ when talking to his son. In order to designate himself otoosan, the speaker has to recognise the fact that he is the father of his child and is in the process of talking to the child. Likewise, to address his brother as niisan ‘older brother’, the speaker must first recognise that he is a younger brother of the addressee and talking to the older brother. Also, when the speaker addresses his son by name or uses personal pronouns such as omae ‘you’, the speaker indicates his role as a father and his status as a superior in his relationship with his son. When he calls the Principal koochoo-sensei ‘the Principal’, he confirms the addressee’s role as a superior and his role as a subordinate.

Suzuki (1973: 198) describes the nature of this personal reference system, stating “the Japanese ego may be construed as being in an indefinite state, with its position undetermined, until a specific addressee, a concrete person, appears and is identified by the speaker” (English translation in Suzuki (1978: 143)). He goes on to state that an individual with specific qualifications and qualities generally demonstrates a specific pattern of behaviour within a social context and it is useful to define the concept of ‘roles’ to refer to this specific and expected behaviour in society. In fact, it has been argued that the acknowledgement of such social roles and hence the relationship between interlocutors’ is one of the most important aspects of the social norms of Japanese communication (Matsumoto, 1988; Ide, 2006). I will discuss this in the next section.
Second, the use of personal reference terms in Japanese is predominantly based on vertical relationships and it is fundamentally ‘asymmetrical’ (Suzuki, 1973: 184). As discussed earlier, the speaker’s choice of an appropriate reference term towards a specific addressee is governed by the speaker’s social superiority or inferiority relative to the addressee. Suzuki (1973: 187) describes this point as follows:

[O]ne must realize how much importance the Japanese attach to roles based on superior-inferior oppositions in everyday human relationships. [...] [I]n Japanese, all terms for self-reference and for address are connected with the confirmation of concrete roles based on a superior-inferior dichotomy in human relationship.


Indeed, some other parameters do exist when stylistic choices are made in Japanese communication, such as non-intimate or intimate and *uchisoto* ‘in-group/out group’ relationships²⁴, and the prescriptive norm may not entirely capture the complexity of the actual address practice in the dynamics of interaction. Nonetheless, as will be discussed in Section 3.3.3, the predominance of vertical relationships in Japanese linguistic practice has been argued by a number of researchers (Nakane, 1967, 1972; Suzuki, 1973, 1978; Lee, 1976; Morita, 1987; Jinnouchi, 1990; Maynard, 1996a; Saito, 1999). The

---

²⁴ Maynard (1996a) notes that apart from inferior-superior differences such as older/younger, higher/lower social status, more prestigious/less prestigious occupations, there are several factors which affect a speaker’s stylistic choice such as *uchisoto* ‘in-group/out-group relations’ and the level of formality in the conversational setting. It is not difficult to imagine that in special cases such as an official ceremony and a formal meeting, every member may use formal forms toward each other regardless of their status relationship. Ide (2006, 2012) uses *uchisoto* in a broader sense in that status differences can be also regarded as *uchisoto*. For instance, someone to whom the speaker is supposed to show deference with the use of polite forms is viewed as a *soto* person.
personal reference system in Japanese strongly reflects this and it is important to keep it in mind in relation to the current study.

3.3. Social norms and Japanese communication

3.3.1. Language and common ground

In the previous section, I discussed the system of Japanese personal reference that is generally regarded as the social norm in Japanese communication. In this section, I will touch on the importance of norms in human communication that scaffolds the discussion of social norms in Japanese communication.

It is increasingly clear in studies of human communication that “joint attention” or “shared experience” (Tomasello, 2008: 4), that is, “our ability to construct and participate in a shared mental world” (Evans, 2010: 70) underlies what makes us uniquely human. Tomasello reveals that in human communication, as simple a gesture as pointing relies heavily on common ground. Tomasello (2008: 3-4) provides an example and gives us an insight into how we may understand a reference at the intersection between the reference and the common ground. I have summarised the example here.

_You and I are walking together to the library and suddenly I point in the direction of some bicycles near the library wall. Your reaction will be “Huh?”, having no idea about the meaning of my indication. However, if you had broken up with your boyfriend recently in a nasty way, and we both knew about it, then the exact same pointing gesture in the same physical situation might come to mean something very different. It will deliver more complex messages such as “your boyfriend’s already at the library (so perhaps we should skip it)” (ibid). On the other hand, if we both know that your bicycle_
was stolen recently, the same pointing gesture will mean something completely different. Further, if we have been wondering whether or not the library was open while walking, then the pointing means that the presence of the bicycles is a sign that the library is open.

The author states that while it is easy to say that the meaning in these different examples is carried by “context”, it is not completely helpful because the physical aspects of the immediate context were identical. He argues that “the only difference was our shared experience beforehand, and that was not the actual content of the communication but only its background” (ibid). This shared background knowledge includes not only the fact that I know a bicycle is your boyfriend’s and that you broke up with him recently, but also that we both know that we know these facts. Even if I know these facts, if I think that you do not know that I know, then it is not enough to say we have the common ground necessary to understand my pointing indication. These facts “must be mutually known common ground between us” (Tomasello, 2008: 4).

Regarding this example, Tomasello (2008: 5) makes two important points. First, “the ability to create common conceptual ground — joint attention, shared experience, common cultural knowledge — is an absolutely critical dimension of all human communication”. Second, from an evolutionary perspective, the example of the ordinary pointing gesture features its “prosocial motivation” (ibid). That is to say, “I am informing you of your ex-boyfriend’s likely presence or the location of your stolen bicycle simply because I think you would want to know these things” (ibid).

Tomasello (2008: 6) argues that the “mutually assumed common conceptual ground” and “mutually assumed cooperative communicative motives” are part of the fundamental nature of human communication. He hypothesises that conventional languages arose by accumulating a shared social learning history.
This sharing/identification motive also led ultimately to the normativity of many social behaviors, the implicit social pressure to do it in the way others do it. As language displays very strong normative structure — both in the way we refer to things with particular linguistic conventions and in the form of utterances as grammatical versus ungrammatical — it is possible that this motive is at least partially responsible for our judgment that “That’s not the way it is said.”

(Tomasello, 2008: 282-283)

This notion is in line with what Wittgenstein called ‘forms of life’ (1953), Bruner’s ‘joint attentional formats’ (1983) and Clark’s ‘common conceptual ground’ (1996). It also leads us to what Enfield (2013: 182) states about the meaning of default formulation from a cognitive perspective.

Whatever a person wants to say, she has to select a certain way of saying it. If we had to ask ourselves, on hearing every piece of every utterance, “Why is this person saying that in that way?” we would unnecessarily — and, no doubt, unbearably — overburden our inferential and interpretative processing. Default, publicly shared, common assumptions about how people typically do and say things provide interpretative channels along which we may travel with minimal cognitive effort. The default is a device by which we can routinely suppress our attention to manner of formulation, and against which we may recognize when something is being done in an unusual way (being then able to ask ourselves why that might be).

(Enfield, 2013: 182)

What we see in Tomasello’s (2008) and Enfield’s (2013) statements is that the fundamental aspect of languages is essentially based on shared knowledge in human communication.
Importantly, while our ability to participate on shared ground is universal at a generic level (Evans, 2010: 69), the diversity of this shared world, that is, what we call culture, brings “different aspects of social cognition to the fore” (Evans, 2010: 70). As we have seen, Japanese has general pragmatic rules in the personal reference system that are particular to Japanese language communication. The habitual and default forms of personal reference terms are strongly governed by shared social norms in Japanese society. Keeping this in mind, the remainder of this section will discuss key notions that form the norms of Japanese communication.

3.3.2. Personhood in Japanese communication

Earlier in Section 3.2, I discussed the general system of Japanese personal reference and pointed out two important aspects of the system; the importance of the speaker’s relationship relative to the addressee and the concept of vertical relationships in Japanese communication. In this section, I discuss the former aspect, that is, the importance of the relative social status of the interlocutors. I will first touch on the notion of personhood in Japanese communication, furthering the discussion of what Suzuki (1973: 198, 1978: 143) described as the ‘indefinite state of ego’.

The concept of personhood in Japanese has been discussed by a number of researchers and they have insightfully pointed out its importance to the understanding of Japanese linguistic practice and communication (Watsuji, 2007 [1934]; Nakane, 1967, 1972; Doi, 1971; Matsumoto, 1988; Hamaguchi, 1998; Maynard, 1996a; Ide, 2006). In my discussion of Japanese personhood, I will also draw on the concepts of personhood in some other cultures, because comparative perspectives can assist a clearer understanding of the point under discussion.
I will start by analysing a proverb about greetings in a language of Senegal, Wolof, provided by Irvine (1974: 175, cited in Foley (1997: 260)): “When two persons greet each other, one has shame, the other has glory”. Foley (1997: 260) explains this as follows:

[T]he distinct linguistic practices associated with the interlocutors in a Wolof greeting encounter are linked to the kinds of persons they are; indeed, considering the way relative ranking can be manipulated during the encounter through the verbal strategies of self-lowering and self-elevating, these linguistic behaviors are constitutive of what kinds of persons they are. Their understanding of what kind of person they are vis-à-vis the other interlocutor is embodied in their habitus.

(Foley, 1997: 260)

Foley (1997: 260) points out that the practices embodied in the habitus are tacitly known, indicative and constitutive of a local ideology of personhood. He draws on cross-cultural differences in the articulation of the concept of personhood. First, regarding a familiar Western European concept of person, he extracts a classic definition from Geertz (1983: 59).

The Western conception of the person as a bounded, unique, more or less integrated motivational cognitive universe, a dynamic center of awareness, emotion, judgment, and action organized into a distinctive whole and set contrastively both against other such wholes and against its social and natural background…

(Geertz, 1983: 59)

The concept emphasises that each individual is unique yet ideologically has an equal claim of rights. Foley (1997) states that this is a result of the Universalist morality in the
Christian base of Western culture, which teaches that the spiritual component in all persons give them a limitless value. This value must be recognised before all other values created in human society. This leads to the view of a person “as an individual, an embodiment of absolute value in her own right, and not simply in terms of her position in any social pattern” (Foley, 1997: 265).

Such an individualist concept of the person shows an apparent contrast to that of many other, commonly traditional cultures (Foley, 1997). In these cultures, individuals are not singled out as the core of the understanding of person, but rather, the embeddedness of the self within the existing social context provides the definition of person.

Personhood is, thus, defined in sociocentric terms, according to the social position a particular human being occupies. The sociocentric conception of personhood regards the good of the social grouping as fundamental and subordinates individual wants and needs to the collective good. […] [T]he claim is that their understanding of personhood, whether tacit or not, is enacted in, indeed, constructed through, linguistic and other cultural practices and thereby, inculcated in the habitus.

(Foley, 1997: 266)

An example of a sociocentric understanding of personhood being expressed in the linguistic habitus is Balinese (Geertz, 1983). The linguistic norm in Bali is based on status differences between interlocutors. Balinese has a large inventory of personal reference terms based on one’s position in the hierarchical structure of the society. There are birth order names (first-born, second-born, etc.), kinship terms, names to describe kinship relations (such as mother of A and sister of B), caste titles and so forth. For Balinese, choosing these terms based on social hierarchies requires knowledge of what
forms are acceptable and what are strictly proscribed in the articulation of the complex rules of linguistic etiquette (Geertz, 1983; Foley, 1997).

The dichotomy of an egocentric vs. sociocentric understanding of personhood tends to be regarded as parallel to that of an egalitarian society vs. hierarchical society. However, sociocentric conceptions of personhood can exist in an egalitarian society as well (Foley, 1997). For example, in a culture with “an aggressively egalitarian ideology” (Foley, 1997: 268), that of Gahuku of the highlands of Papua New Guinea, authority, power and esteem can be earned through economic and physical power. Yet there is also a rigid prescription of appropriate behavior in this society. Read (1955: 276) describes Gahuku culture as follows:

To the Gahaku-Gama, the palpable differences between people, the idiosyncratic variations in their natures, are like a shimmer which overlies their social identity. They are not unaware of these variations: they do not ignore them; but they do not distinguish, as clearly as we are accustomed to, between the individual and the status which he occupies. They tend, in other words, to categorize, to see men largely in terms of their position in a system of social rights and obligations […] the more outstanding a man is the more he is held in, and the more pronounced his own esteem the more closely he identifies himself with his status. Individual identity and social identity are two sides of the same coin. We ourselves are accustomed to distinguish between them…

(Read, 1955: 276)

Here, the person and her rights and obligations are also a function of social position. In Gahaku, distinct from Balinese, social status is achieved by winning in open competition in an egalitarian society. Nonetheless, both Gahuku and Bali have a sociocentric ideology of personhood (Foley, 1997). “In both societies the persons are largely
understood to be their social positions, while in Western societies the social position is just that, an office that the person as an autonomous individual occupies” (Foley, 1997: 269).

Returning to Japanese, we have explored the system of personal reference terms in Japanese in Section 3.2. One may easily recognise similarities between Balinese and Japanese in terms of possessing abundant items of personal reference terms, although Japanese does not recognise caste, and the strictness of their use may also be different. What is evident is that Japanese society also holds a strongly sociocentric notion of personhood in its linguistic practice. In fact, discussions regarding such a notion are not at all new in traditional Japanese ethical philosophy.

The ethics philosopher Watsuji Tetsuro (2007 [1937]) states that morality is understood in various communities as the heart of human existence and its principle is based fundamentally on the order of relationships between human and human. Watsuji (2007 [1937]) argues:

*Rinri mondai no basho wa koritsuteki kojin no ishiki ni dewa nakushite, masani hito to hito tono aidagara ni aru. Dakara, rinrigaku wa ningen no gaku nano dearu. Hitot to hito tono aidagara no mondai toshite denakute wa, kooi no zen’aku mo gimu mo sekinin mo toku mo shin ni toku koto wa dekinai.*

(Watsuji, 2007: 20 [1937])

The locus of ethical problems lies not in the consciousness of the isolated individual, but precisely in the in-betweenness of person and person. Because of this, ethics is the study of *ningen*. Unless we regard ethics as dealing with matters arising between person and person, we cannot authentically solve such problems as the distinguishing of good from evil deeds, obligation, responsibility, virtue, and so forth.

(Translation in Yamamoto and Carter, 1996: 10)
Watsuji’s central idea is that the structure of ‘humanity’ is twofold, that is, it is “at once individual and social” (Berque, 2006: 138). According to Watsuji (2007 [1934]), the very concept of \textit{ningen} subsumes the idea of an ethical relationship between individuals that makes them human in the full sense of the term. Watsuji (2007 [1934]) explains:

\textit{Hito ga honrai shakaiteki doobutsu dearu no naraba, aitagara toka shakai toka iu mono wa hito kara hikihanasaru beki denai. Hito wa kobetsuteki ni ariuru to tomoni mata shakaiteki dearu tokoro no mono de nakutewa naranu. Sooshite kono yoona nijuuseikaku o mottomo yoku iirawashiteiru no ga “ningen” to iu kotoba nano dearu.}

(Watsuji, 2007: 26 [1937])

[If] a human being is, basically speaking, a social animal, then social relationship cannot be separated from her. It must be that a human being is capable of being an individual and at the same time also a member of a society. And the Japanese term \textit{ningen}, that is “human being,” gives most adequate expression to this double or dual characteristic.


This concept of personhood is followed by what Hamaguchi (1998: 14) puts forward as the \textit{kankeitai} ‘relatum’ conception, which is presented in contrast to \textit{kobetsutai} ‘individuum’ in his discussion of social systems. \textit{Kobetsutai} frames an agent’s self-control and self-decision as the foundation of personhood and society, without considering the relationship between the self and given conditions. In a \textit{kobetsutai} society, self-determination and fair and free competition are two sides of the same coin. This is often seen in some Western societies, typically in American society, and tends to be regarded as universally rational and efficient (Hamaguchi, 1998). However, it is not necessarily the basis of other societies such as Japan. Hamaguchi
(1998: 14-15) argues that kankeitai ‘relatum’ conceives of a relationship between the agent and the given contexts/conditions within which the self is placed as being sutesaru koto no dekinai shoyotekina mono ‘something essentially given that cannot be renounced’. Hamaguchi (1998: 16) calls this concept kan’yoteki shutai, which can be closely translated as ‘relationised agent’, as if the relationship itself is the agent of activities.

Another scholar, Mori (1979) characterises the Japanese concept of self as being non-autonomous. Mori calls the concept nikoo kankei ‘binary combination’ or ‘binary rapport’ (Mori, 1979: 66; translations in Maynard, 2001b: 8). In Mori’s view, among Japanese, the opposite of nanji ‘you’ is not ‘self’ but nanji no nanji ‘your you’. For example, a child’s self is not the self which has its ontological root in itself but the child experiences self as ‘you’ from the perspective of the parents. Likewise, the child’s parents are ‘you’ from the child’s perspective. The Japanese self is viewed as ‘your you’ and thus relies on the existence of another. The concept is further comparable to Miller’s statement (1993: 482) that among Japanese, “subjectivity seems to co-exist routinely with a genuine sense of shared identity”. Maynard (1996a: 4) notes that the underlying notion in Japanese communication is “relationality”, especially “society-relational orientation”.

All these scholars’ views regarding the concept of personhood in Japanese are intriguingly homogeneous. It appears that the concept of self in Japanese is inseparable

---

25 As an approximation, “ontology is the study of what there is. Some contest this formulation of what ontology is, so it’s only a first approximation. Many classical philosophical problems are problems in ontology: the question whether or not there is a god, or the problem of the existence of universals, etc. These are all problems in ontology in the sense that they deal with whether or not a certain thing, or more broadly entity, exists.” (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2016)
from the existence of the other, and being in a relationship *per se* is the heart of human being-ness. This concept is the key to the understanding of Japanese communication. Given this, we are able to understand better that the personal reference system in Japanese symbolically reflects this concept of personhood in Japanese communication.

### 3.3.3. Vertical relationships in Japan

In this section I discuss the second of two important aspects of the use of Japanese personal reference terms, namely, the importance of the vertical relationship. As shown in Section 3.2, Suzuki (1973) describes the nature of Japanese communication as inherently ‘asymmetrical’ and points out the importance of vertical relationships as the basis of it. As relationship-orientated linguistic practices require consciousness and recognition of interlocutors’ social statuses, I will first take a look at how Japanese understand social status.

At a general level, Foley (1997: 307) states that apart from obvious biological attributions such as gender, age and kin relationships, the urban-based societies of Europe, the Americas, Asia, and Australasia have complex and extensive “*social stratification*, in which people are grouped into strata of higher or lower prestige and, often, concomitant power, power being the ability to realise one’s wants and interests even against resistance”. However, he also states that status includes some vague and subjective judgment which depends on one’s beliefs. On the other hand, social status in the sense of social roles can differentiate one’s social position and entitlements more clearly, such as in a doctor-patient or teacher-student context (Foley, 1997). Recall the system of personal reference terms in Japanese shown in Section 3.2. It is apparent that the system is predominantly based on a social role-based status relationship.
In terms of categories of human relations, in abstract terms, ‘vertical’ relations and ‘horizontal’ relations are both observed in societies (Nakane, 1967, 1972). For instance, the parent-child relationship and the superior-inferior relationship are vertical, while the sibling relationship and the colleague relationship are horizontal. According to Nakane (1967, 1972), depending on the society, one of these relationships has a more important or dominant function than the other, or both relationships function equally (Nakane, 1967, 1972). In Japanese society, the importance of vertical relationships has been pointed out by a number of researchers (Nakane, 1967, 1972; Suzuki, 1973, 1978; Lee, 1976; Morita, 1987; Jinnouchi, 1990; Saito, 1999; Ide, 2006). Nakane (1972: 30) uses the phrase “rank conscious” which, she argues, evidently exists in Japanese society.

When the vertical relation, which is theoretically predictable from the manner in which Japanese social groups are formed, is actually stressed and functionalized, and becomes the structural principle in uniting the members of a group, an amazingly delicate and intricate system of rank takes shape. This is because even individuals who belong to the same group and have equal qualifications are affected by this vertical structure so that they begin to define and emphasize differences among themselves in some way or other.

(Nakane, 1972: 30)

For example, among employees in the same job with the same ability and qualifications, differences are made evident based on a vertical perspective such as on the basis of age, year of joining the company, length of service and so forth. It is also well known that even a one-year difference between *sempai* ‘senior’ and *koohai* ‘junior’ among students and colleagues is emphasised. Nakane (1972) states that the distinction between *sempai* and *koohai* functions to a surprisingly large extent in social groups.
It is reasonable to question whether present-day young people have some different ideas about these vertical relationships as Nakane’s work was written in the 1970s. A recent online survey of Japanese young people (Ameba, 2013) revealed a strong awareness of the senior-junior difference. In the survey, three hundred and seventy-eight Japanese youth between nineteen and twenty-nine years old were asked if they should be respectful towards seniors solely on the basis of their age. Respondents who answered ‘I do not think so at all’ numbered 3.4%. In contrast, 84.2% of the respondents thought they should be respectful (‘I strongly think so’ 19.1%, ‘I think so to some extent’ 65.1%). Respondents’ comments included Reigi dakara. Amari sonkei dekinai hito demo keishikiteki niwa keii o harau ‘It’s etiquette. So, even if I don’t truly respect someone, I still show a formal respect to him/her’ and Toshiue dearu kara keii o harau nowa toozen no koto. Shikashi, toshiue no hito ga itte iru kara to itte sore ga subete tadashii toi no wa mata chigau to omou ‘It’s natural to show respect towards seniors. However, it doesn’t mean that what they say is all correct’, and there were other similar comments. These opinions from young people show that the importance of vertical relationships in communication, at least as etiquette or custom, remains consistent among present-day youth in Japanese society.

It should be noted that while Nakane (1967, 1972) focuses especially strongly on group orientation and hierarchy, there are alternative approaches to viewing Japanese society. They include Doi’s (1971) “anatomy of dependence” approach, Yanabu’s (1998) omote/ura ‘two sides’ of Japanese cultural structure, Kawai’s (1976) ‘matrilineal society’ and more. A discussion about Japanese society as a whole and in every possible aspect is indeed far beyond the scope of this study. Naturally, it is not my purpose to resolve issues raised by these different approaches to the analysis of Japanese society.
At the same time, it is also not my intention to endorse extreme or simplistic interpretations of vertical relationships. What I do want to emphasise as being relevant is that as far as the system of personal references in Japanese described in Section 3.2 is concerned, I do recognise the importance of the vertical relationship. Consciousness of the relative status between interlocutors and the weight put on the vertical relationship is something that must be attended to constantly in Japanese communication. The system of personal references in Japanese is a strong reflection of this.

3.3.4. Politeness in Japanese communication

The importance of vertical relationships in Japanese communication has often been discussed in tandem with linguistic politeness in Japanese. For this reason, this section deals with politeness in Japanese communication.

The word ‘politeness’ is ambiguous because what constitutes linguistic politeness or politeness itself has not been entirely clarified in past studies. Lakoff (1973a, 1977), who pioneered the argument about the necessity of considering context when discussing politeness, states that politeness has rules just like the Grice’s (1975) Cooperative Principle has maxims. They are rules such as ‘Don’t impose’ and ‘Give options’, ‘Be friendly’ (Lakoff, 1973a: 298). Leech (1983) also describes politeness within the paradigm of conversational maxims. He divides the Politeness Principle into numerous maxims such as the Generosity Maxim, Agreement Maxim and Sympathy Maxim. Leech (1983) implicitly classifies different speech act types as polite or non-polite and describes politeness as a means of conflict avoidance.

Notably, Brown and Levinson (1987) posit universals for linguistic politeness based on Goffman’s (1955) notion of ‘face’. They treat face as the public self-image that
every member of a society wants to claim for himself or herself, that is, it is one of the “basic wants” of members of a society (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62). ‘Face’ consists of two related aspects:

Negative face: the want of every ‘competent adult member’ that his actions be unimpeded by others.
Positive face: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.

(Brown and Levinson, 1987: 62)

According to Brown and Levinson (1987), there are acts which inherently threaten face within interaction, so called FTA (face-threatening acts). FTA includes acts such as orders, requests, suggestions, advice, warnings, offers, promises, compliments, criticism and disagreement. Unless the speaker wants to intentionally threaten the addressee’s face, s/he is supposed to try to minimise the threat by avoiding or redressing FTA. Brown and Levinson (1987: 129) states that “negative politeness is regressive action addressed to the addressee’s negative face: his want to have his freedom of action unhindered and his attention unimpeded. It is the heart of respect behavior”. On the other hand, “positive politeness is redress directed to the addressee’s positive face, his perennial desire that his wants (or the actions/acquisitions/values resulting from them) should be thought of as desirable” (1987: 101).

These definitions of politeness in pioneering works have some aspects in common. First, in these studies, politeness is fundamentally recognised as having to do with an individual’s intentional action, often mentioned as ‘strategy’, especially to mitigate and soften FTA. Second, explicitly or implicitly, they wish to claim universality for politeness.
However, this notion of politeness is considered to be qualitatively different from what is regarded as politeness in various cultures including Japanese (Matsumoto, 1988; Ide, 1989, 1992a, 2006, 2012; Janney and Arndt, 1993; Watts, Ide and Enlich, 1992; Foley, 1997).


(6) **Kyoo wa ame da.**
   today TOP rain BE-INF
   ‘(It’s) raining today.’

(7) **Kyoo wa ame desu.**
   today TOP rain BE-FOR
   ‘(It’s) raining today.’

(Ide, 2006: 72)

The above examples are identical except for the casual ending *da* in (6) and the polite ending *desu* in (7). The propositional meaning of the two sentences is the same ‘(It’s) raining today’. Ide (2006) states that even for such an utterance, which is uttered only spontaneously, Japanese distinguishes the style of the sentence almost automatically based on the context of interaction. She argues that it is difficult and unconvincing to interpret this aspect of language use in Japanese as being a speaker’s intentional act or strategy to address an addressee’s positive or negative politeness. Backhouse (1993) also states that Japanese has a large number of fixed formulas in interaction, and the use of
these expressions are rather “linguistic etiquette and protocol” (Backhouse, 1993: 183) in social interaction.

To explain the nature of politeness in Japanese communication adequately, Ide (1989, 1992a, 2006, 2012) proposes the notion of *wakimae*. She states that “*wakimae* means social norms according to which people are expected to behave in order to be appropriate in the society they live” (Ide, 1992a: 298). For the English translation of this word *wakimae*, initially ‘discernment’ was selected (Hill et al., 1986; Ide, 1989). However, as Hill et al. (1986: 347-348) point out, this English term does not capture the notion of *wakimae* sufficiently and they state that “[n]o single English word translates *wakimae* adequately, but ‘discernment’ reflects its basic sense”. Ide (1992a: 299) also makes additional comment later and confirms that ‘discernment’ is in fact insufficient to cover the range of meaning of *wakimae* including a notion such as “observation of social norms”. Ide (1992a: 299) rephrases the explanation:

> *Wakimae* is sets of social norms of appropriate behavior people have to observe in order to be considered polite in the society they live. One is polite only if he or she behaves in congruence with the expected norms in a certain situation, in a certain culture and society. Just like a set of rules you follow when you play a game, you follow *wakimae* in your game of life. Thus, speaking within the confines of *wakimae* is not an act of expressing the speaker’s intention, but rather of complying with socially expected norms. The speaker’s attention is paid not to what he or she intends to express, but rather to what is expected of him or her by social norms.

(Ide, 1992a: 299)

Foley (1997: 309) states that in many cultures native speakers are “often highly attuned” to their status relative to someone else in any interaction, and this leads members of the
society to have “culturally mandated patterns of deference/ avoidance”. The notion of \textit{wakimae} provides insight and can appropriately explain culturally specific and almost mandated patterns of politeness in Japanese. Given the notion of personhood in Japanese communication discussed in Section 3.3.1, Ide’s (2006: 75) following observation is informative.

\textit{Shakaiteki serufu [...] sono tokuchoo wa, shakai no ningenkankei, sunawachi, yakuwari, chii ni oojite henkashi, sono toki sono toki no ba no naka de jiko o ichizuketeiru kahensei no aru serufu dearu. Sonoyoona serufu o sooteishita shakai ni okeru poraitonesu wa, Brown and Levinson no kangaeru yoona, shikkarito shita kojin ga onaji yooni shikkarito shita serufu o motsu aite ni taishite hatarakikakeru sutoratejii ni wa najimanai.}

(Ide, 2006: 75)

Social self […], its special feature is the fluidity of self, namely, self that is changeable depending on social relations, roles and statuses. This self is situated in \textit{ba\textsuperscript{26}} ‘place’ context by context. Politeness in the society that holds this notion of self does not fit to the framework proposed by Brown and Levinson. It is not a strategy with which the absolute self involves another absolute self.

What is relevant and most important about the concept of \textit{wakimae} for the current study is that the use of personal reference terms is strongly governed by the social norms which are conceptually most proximate to what Ide calls \textit{wakimae}. For example, Ide (2006) argues that in Japanese society, one refers to teachers, professors, medical doctors,

---

\textsuperscript{26} \textit{Ba} theory was first proposed by Shimizu (2000, 2008) to explain how we are situated in the place of interaction. Fuji (2012: 657) explains Japanese interaction using \textit{ba} theory by stating “in Japanese interaction, the participants are always concerned about the partner’s position as well as their own. They reorient themselves at every moment of the interaction using the linguistic devices that seek the partner’s response”.
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politicians and so forth as *sensei*, but this does not necessarily mean that it happens out of respect. Rather, the speakers use the term *sensei* because they are supposed to do so, in other words, society expects them to do so. Recall the online survey mentioned in Section 3.3.3. In the survey, even present-day young Japanese people expressed a view that showing respect towards seniors was etiquette rather than an expression of a true feeling of respect. Maynard (1996a: 57) similarly emphasises that in Japanese society, “the management of social comfort includes the recognition and expression of situational and social differences among speakers”.

This is not to say that the dominance of wakimae in Japanese culture precludes volitional aspects of a speaker’s language use. Hill et al. (1986: 348), in their comparative study of Japanese and Americans’ notions of politeness, present the following figure.

(8) A scheme of strategies for linguistic politeness

![Scheme of strategies for linguistic politeness](image)

Hill et al. (1986: 348)

---

27 Shigematsu (1956) points out that teachers refer to each other as *sensei* regardless of their status differences. For example, senior teachers still refer to their juniors as *sensei*.
This figure illustrates schematically the relative prominence of discernment, or more precisely wakimae, in the polite use of language by speakers of Japanese. On the other hand, volition seems to be more predominant in the polite use of American English.

Importantly, the use of a personal reference system is not grammatically ruled but pragmatically governed. This means that there is indeed room for a speaker to show their different attitudes (volition) when there are expected social norms (wakimae). In other words, the speaker may ‘deviate’ from the norm to express his/her particular emotional/psychological attitude, identity and ideology in the dynamics of interaction. In this study, I reveal that the use of anata is often regarded as a deviation from the norm. For this reason, the particular focus on the use of anata will lead to the unveiling of the very dynamics of interaction through the use of the term. In this sense, anata shows aspects of the use of personal reference terms which cannot necessarily be explained by the notion of wakimae. Rather, because of the very existence of the wakimae expectation, that is, the existence of this social norm in the personal reference system in Japanese communication, the expressive effects created by the use of anata come to be explicable.

### 3.4. The history of anata

#### 3.4.1. From a demonstrative to a polite second person pronoun

This section outlines the history of the use of anata, which is relevant to the discussion in the current study. Before focusing on anata, I will briefly touch on some general tendencies in the historical transformation of Japanese personal pronouns.

It is well known that personal pronouns in Modern Japanese come from a variety of origins such as lexical and grammatical sources (Sakuma, 1959; Tsujimura, 1968; Ri,
Ishiyama (2008) classified Japanese personal pronouns into two types based on their origins.

The first type is a group of pronouns that have clear lexical origins. For example, the first person pronoun *boku* originally had a lexical meaning ‘servant’ and the second person pronoun *kimi* had that of ‘lord’. Initially, *boku* was used as a humble form to refer to the speaker and *kimi* was used as an exalted form to refer to the addressee. They then became semantised as personal pronouns. Further, the humble/respectful meaning was lost and in Modern Japanese, *boku* and *kimi* are informal first and second person pronouns respectively (Ishiyama, 2008).

The second type is a group of pronouns that originate in expressions that refer to place/direction, or demonstratives. An example of the former is the second person pronoun *omae* ‘(lit.) honorable front’. According to Ishiyama (2008), *omae* developed from a locative noun to a marker of a speech role, that is, a word which metonymically refers to a person in that location. Gradually, it was semanticised as a second person pronoun. This group also includes *konata* ‘this way’ and *sonata* ‘that way’ which are no longer used in ordinary conversation today (Tsujimura, 1968; Hashimoto, 1982; Ishiyama, 2008). *Anata* belongs to this group, that is, *anata* originated as a demonstrative to refer to a direction ‘that way, over there’ (Tsujimura, 1968; Hashiguchi, 1998; Ishiyama, 2008).

In terms of the diachronic relationship between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns, Ishiyama (2012) states that demonstratives do not generally give rise to first/second person pronouns. Although both of them are deictic, there is in fact a crucial difference between them (Diessel, 2003; Ishiyama, 2012). Diessel (2003) shows that the fundamental function of demonstratives is to direct the hearer’s attention to
entities in the surrounding situation. Importantly, these entities are previously inactivated in the addressee’s cognitive state in the speech situation. On the other hand, first/second pronouns are, in most instances, presupposed in the speech situation. In other words, first/second person pronouns are almost never used to direct the addressee to search for previously inactivated information. Ishiyama (2012) argues that because of this difference in the cognitive status of the referent of demonstratives and first/second person pronouns, there is little diachronic relationship between them. He states that “the lack of relationship between demonstratives and first/second person pronouns is based on their dissimilar pragmatic functions and the nature of the referents they refer to” (Ishiyama, 2012: 63).

Ishiyama (2008, 2012) also states that another reason why demonstratives do not generally give rise to first/second person pronouns is because “demonstratives can already refer to the speaker and addressee within the scope of their original demonstrative function” (Ishiyama, 2012: 59-60).

To put it another way, there is little functional motivation for demonstratives to become semanticised as markers of speech roles (i.e. first and second person). When demonstratives refer to an entity which happens to occupy the role of the speaker/addressee in the speech situation, there is no need for one to reanalyze demonstratives as personal pronouns unless that is the only context in which those demonstrative forms are used.

(Ishiyama, 2012: 60)

However, this does not mean that such a development never happens. Anata is an example of this case (Ishiyama, 2008; 2012). To see how anata has developed from a demonstrative to a second person pronoun, let us look at the historical stages of Japanese
language and a summary of the demonstratives *konata*, *sonata* and *anata*. Table (9) below is the standard classification used in historical studies such as Tsujimura (1968) and Ri (2002) and Ishiyama (2008; 2012).

(9) Historical stages of Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Approximate date</th>
<th>Corresponding historical period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage I</td>
<td>700-800</td>
<td>Nara Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage II</td>
<td>800-1200</td>
<td>Heian Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage III</td>
<td>1200-1600</td>
<td>Kamakura/Muromachi Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage IV</td>
<td>1600-1870</td>
<td>Edo Period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage V</td>
<td>1870-Present</td>
<td>Meiji Period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ishiyama, 2008: 9)

Following the historical stages shown in table (9) above, Ishiyama (2008: 131) clarifies the usages of each demonstrative as follows and he further divides Stage IV into two parts.

(10) Historical summary of *konata*, *sonata*, and *anata*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Konata</th>
<th>Sonata</th>
<th>Anata</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>S-PROX</td>
<td>S-DIST</td>
<td>S-DIST Non-S/AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>S-PROX</td>
<td>S-REF</td>
<td>S-DIST AD-REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>S-PROX</td>
<td>AD-REF</td>
<td>S-DIST AD-REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>S-PROX</td>
<td>AD-REF</td>
<td>AD-PROX AD-REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>1870-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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S-REF (a referent that happens to be a speaker), AD-REF (a referent that happens to be an addressee) and Non-S/AD (a referent that is neither speaker nor addressee) are embedded in the demonstrative box to show that they are not semanticised person markers and they are not independent of the demonstrative function. On the other hand, the term ‘2nd’ used for anata in the second half of Stage IV and V indicates that it is a semanticised second person marker, thus ‘2nd’ is separated from ‘S/AD-DIST’ in the second half of Stage IV (Ishiyama, 2008: 131).

Originally, konata was speaker-proximal (S-PROX) while sonata and anata were speaker-distal (S-DIST), although sonata was often used for direction/location near the addressee, suggesting an addressee-proximal (AD-PROX) function in the next stage. In Stage III and the first half of Stage IV, these forms started being used metonymically to refer to a person, while retaining their original demonstrative functions. Konata was used for the first/second person, sonata for the second person, and anata for the third person. Ishiyama (2012: 63) states that the “shift of konata from the first to second person can be explained by preemption of addressee-proximal forms by speaker-proximal forms, and the continued use of sonata for the second person is in accordance with the lack of preemption in the reverse direction”.

However, he also states that anata’s shift from third to second person cannot be attributed to its spatial semantics. In Stage IV, the a-series of demonstratives was speaker/addressee-distal. Ishiyama (2012: 63) says that “[i]t is hard to see how a speaker/addressee-distal form could be used to designate the addressee if it is considered a part of its demonstrative function, especially when there are dedicated addressee-proximal forms (i.e. so-series)”. For the use of anata in this stage, Ri (2002) points out that in his data, its use in referring to second person carried respectful meanings in this stage. Given this, Ishiyama (2008: 2012) argues that the use of anata to refer to a second person at the same stage was a distancing politeness strategy which included a well-
known cross-linguistic phenomena, such as distancing in time (the use of past tense is more polite) and number (plural form is more polite). The use of *anata* involves distancing in space. In the second half of Stage IV, the use of *anata* for the second person became increasingly popular but Ishiyama (2008) states that it is still not entirely obvious whether *anata* has grammaticalised its second person usage. He argues that the grammaticalisation of *anata* as a second person function is clear in Stage V because its original demonstrative function has vanished.

Having briefly looked at the historical development of *anata* with other demonstratives *konata* and *sonata*, I draw on Ishiyama’s (2012: 66) summary here.

To sum up, the development of *anata* differs from other demonstrative-based forms because it has reached the stage where the pronoun function has become independent of the original demonstrative function. That is why it was possible for *anata* to survive even after the disappearance of its demonstrative function. In this sense, the development of *anata* is somewhat akin to that of German *Sie* in that distancing is employed for politeness purposes. The former involves distancing in terms of spatial distance, whereas the latter primarily involves distancing in terms of person categories (i.e. a third person form for a second person referent).

(Ishiyama, 2012: 66)

In the next section, I will discuss the transition of *anata* after it became semanticised as a polite/formal second person pronoun. The focal point is its degree of politeness, which has been discussed in many studies (Sakuma, 1959; Tsujimura, 1968; Komatsu, 1996; Hashiguchi, 1998; Barke and Uehara, 2005; Ishiyama, 2008).
3.4.2. The pragmatic depreciation of *anata*

As we have seen in the previous section, *anata* was semantically and pragmatically transformed from a demonstrative to a formal second person pronoun. In this section, I outline how *anata*’s politeness value has changed in Modern Japanese. I have mentioned the transformation of the first person pronoun *boku* and the second person pronoun *kimi* in the previous section. *Anata* has also gone through a change in its pragmatic value. Regarding this, it is known from diachronic studies that Japanese personal pronouns in general have gone through a rapid succession, new terms being created one after another and replacing earlier ones which lost their politeness value (Sakuma, 1959; Suzuki, 1973, 1978).

Sakuma (1959: 103) claims that this phenomenon is particularly often observed in the use of personal pronouns as well as in the use of honorifics in Japanese. Sakuma (1959) further states that among deictic words, while those belonging to a group of non-personal demonstratives such as *koko* ‘here’ and *soko* ‘there’ have been historically consistent in meaning and usages, personal pronouns show kaleidoscopic changes. He explains that this is because the use of personal pronouns, as with that of honorifics, is strongly related to human relationships. In other words, the phenomenon of vicissitude of these words shows that their use has been inevitably transformed in relation to psychological aspects of language use, such as the speakers’ attitude of conforming to the demands of social norms and expectations in the speech community.

In the field of Japanese linguistics, the tendency for the loss of humble or respectful meanings to occur over a period of time is known as *keii zengen no hoosoku* ‘theory of depreciation of politeness’ (Tsujimura, 1968: 205). It includes a mechanism

---

28 In his historical study of honorifics in Japanese, Tsujimura (1968) lists 81 second person pronouns.
that is similar to Dahl’s (2001:471) ‘inflationary effects’. Dahl (2001) argues that the loss of politeness value is similar to the economic phenomena whereby excessive issuance of money will depreciate the value of the currency. Dahl (2001: 471) states that “if the number of Grand Dukes in the country doubles, the value of that title is bound to decrease”. In other words, as more and more people regard the usage as acceptable, the rhetorical effects are also lost. In the cases of boku and kimi noted earlier, the loss of their humble/respectful meanings are regarded as examples of such an effect. Further, a number of researchers have pointed out that anata has also gone through this process of diminishment of its politeness value (Sakuma, 1959; Komatsu, 1996; Hashiguchi, 1998; Miwa, 2000; Barke and Uehara, 2005; Ishiyama, 2008). As seen in Chapter 1, numerous dictionaries note that anata used to be an honorific but it is no longer the case today, or that its respectful nuance is declining nowadays, as evidence of the decrease in the politeness value of anata.

Although to what extent and when the decrease occurred is not entirely clear, some evidence is provided in Kojima (1974). He claims that Tokyo-variety Japanese in the early Meiji period included not only the use of anata towards a superior as the politest form, but also allowed its use towards an equal and inferior. Kojima (1974: 70) extracts the following examples from a novel Ukigumo published in 1887. Osei is a young female from a middle class family and Bunzo is her male cousin who is a public servant. They use anata towards each other in a casual conversation.

(11) Bunzo: Soredewa nan desu ka. Honda wa anata no
So what BE QUE FN TOP 2PP: anata LK
kini itta to iu n desu ka.
get.to.like QT say NOM BE QUE
‘So, what is it? Would you (anata) say (you) got to like Honda?’

Osei: *Kini iru mo iranai mo nai keredomo, anata no iu yoona get.to.like.or.not CN 2PP: anata SUB say like sono yoona harenchina hito jaarimasen wa.
that like shameless person BE-NEG SFP

‘It’s not whether (I) got to like (him) or not. (He) is not such a shameful person as you (anata) say’.

(Ukigumo, 1887)

They are cousins and of equal status. Also, the topic of their conversation in (11) is highly private. Kojima (1974) claims that although the formal-verbal endings (or desu/masu forms) are employed, the conversation setting can be regarded as quite relaxed and casual rather than formal and hence has already started showing the decrease of the degree of formality.

Moving on to the beginning of the 1900’s, Jung (2003) has investigated the frequency of the use of second person pronouns in eight novels published between 1895 and 1935. She reports that anata and kimi appear more frequently (anata 35%, kimi 35%, of all second person address terms) than do omae (19%), anta (6%) and omaesan (5%). Jung (2003) also examined sixteen movie scenarios from 1997 to 1999 and reported that the use of anata had declined to 19% at this stage. However, due to the specific focus of the study, Jung (2003) does not show the details of the interlocutors and conversational contexts where particular address terms are used. That is, which speaker is using anata to which addressee and in what kind of situation is not made clear, hence the distribution of the use of anata is also not clear.

Indicators of general perceptions regarding the use of anata can be found in other materials. Hashiguchi (1998) reports that the use of anata is mentioned in some
educational guidelines and language policy scripts of the early 1900’s. For example, *Shihan-gakkoo Chuugakkoo Sahoo Kyooju Yookoo* ‘Educational Guidebook for Normal and Secondary Schools’ published in 1911 advises on the use of second person pronouns as follows:

*Taishoo wa tsuujoo ‘anata’ to su beshi, doohai ni taishite wa ‘kimi’ to shoosuru mo sashitsukae nashi.*

The word to be used for any addressees should be ‘anata’, however, using ‘kimi’ for social equals is harmless, too.

*(Shihan-gakkoo Chuugakkoo Sahoo Kyooju Yookoo ‘Educational Guidebook for Normal and Secondary Schools’, 1911)*

Even with the statement *tsuujoo ‘anata’ to subeshi ‘it should normally be anata’, it is still difficult to know how ‘normally’ anata could be used without seeing actual examples. Nonetheless, such a statement suggests that anata was not regarded as highest-level honorific address term at that stage and it was possible to use it more widely towards an addressee of equal or inferior status relative to the speaker. This is in line with the relatively more frequent use of anata around this time shown earlier in Jung’s work (2003). That said, Ishiyama (2008: 127) states that the use of anata still carried some sense of politeness around this time.

However, another guidebook published not long after the previous example explicitly indicates the inappropriateness of using anata towards a superior. The
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29 Although such educational guidelines tend to be prescriptive and the guiding principle is based on native speakers’ intuition rather than empirical data, it is still useful as governmental advice can reflect certain tendencies in society at the given time. Morford (1997: 8) notes that consulting etiquette guides, professional handbooks, the popular press and so forth offers insights into “linguistic norms and social significance of particular patterns of pronominal address at various periods”.

*Taishoo wa tsuujoo ‘anata’ to shoosubeshi. Doohai ni taishite wa ‘kimi’ to shoosuru mo sashitsukae nashi. Tatoeba kyooshi ni taishite ‘anata’ nado to itte wa kaette kikigurushii mono dearu. Konoyooni, tokutei no hito ni taishite wa, sensei, otoosama, okaasama, ojiisama, obaasama, obasama, daredaresama, nado to iu.*

‘As for address terms, it should normally be *anata*. Towards an equal, it is acceptable to use *kimi*. If *anata* is used towards a teacher, for example, it is unpleasant to hear. As such, towards a particular addressee, use ‘teacher’, ‘father’, ‘mother’, ‘grandfather’, ‘grandmother’, ‘aunt’, ‘someone-sama’ and so forth.’


From this extract, the use of *anata* at this time was already regarded as inappropriate in cases where there were other expected terms such as titles and kinship terms which could be used towards a superior. Hashiguchi (1998) claims that the point at which the use of *anata* as an honorific ceased seems to be around this time, namely, the early Showa era before World War II. Another publication *Reihoo Yookoo* ‘Handbook of Manners’, produced by The Ministry of Education, clearly states that the use of *anata* should normally be a form for use amongst equals.

*Taishoo wa, choojoji ni taishite wa, mibun ni oojite sootoo no keishoo o mochiiru. Doohai ni taishite wa, tsuujoo ‘anata’ o mochii, danshi wa ‘kimi’ o mochiitemo yoi.*
As for address terms, towards a superior, use appropriate respectful address terms depending on their status. Towards an equal, normally use ‘anata’, but it is acceptable for men to use ‘kimi’.

(Reihoo Yookoo ‘Handbook of Manners’, 1941)

Stating that anata should be the appropriate term between equals suggests that anata’s value has become roughly neutral in terms of its degree of politeness around this time.

Thus far, we have seen the change of anata’s degree of politeness fall from polite to a roughly neutral level. Interestingly, the perception that the use of anata indicates an equal status between interlocutors elevated anata into a focal point of language policy proposal in postwar Japan. While this will be discussed in Chapter 8, it is useful to note briefly here that in the flow of emerging egalitarianism in postwar Japan, anata was officially assigned a notion of egalitarianism with its use. In 1952, the National Language Council proposed that anata should be a ‘standard’ address term and should be used amongst any individuals in most situations. Apparently, anata was treated as a symbol of equality which was ideologically motivated in the new era. Nevertheless, native speakers were confused by the definition and there were heated debates about it in public realms. As noted in Chapter 1, native speakers’ confusion and public debates over the use of anata continue to this day.

3.5. Summary

This chapter presented an overview of commonly used personal reference terms in Modern Japanese and the overall system of their use. First, I noted systematic rules in the use of personal reference terms and demonstrated what is expected in the relationship between interlocutors in Japanese communication. Awareness of expectations about the
appropriate use of personal reference terms is very important for the later discussion on the use of *anata* in Chapters 4 to 8.

Second, I discussed the importance of common ground or shared knowledge, that is, norms of communication. In particular, I explained social norms in Japanese communication by considering the concept of the ‘relational’ self and the importance of vertical relationships. In addition, I also discussed the notion of politeness in Japanese society. I adopted the notion of *wakimae* and suggested that aspects of the use of personal reference terms were related to the recognition of *wakimae*.

Third, in relation to the degree of politeness that the use of *anata* entails, I looked at the history of *anata*. Contention over the use of *anata* is partly related to the historical change in its pragmatic value. That is, today’s discussion regarding *anata* is mainly a discussion of its degree of politeness, which has been perceived as unclear.

The discussion in this chapter regarding social norms of the Japanese personal reference system, concepts of personhood and politeness in Japanese communication and the history of *anata* are relevant precisely because the remainder of the thesis is devoted to showing how the use of *anata* interacts with established social norms and expectations which are necessarily socio-historically and culturally formulated.
Chapter 4

The perceptions of native speakers

4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines how native speakers of Japanese perceive the use of anata. As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, there have been several distinct ways of perceiving the use of anata in the previous literature of Japanese linguistics. Reflecting the complexity of its interpretation, avoidance of the term is evidenced in the ordinary conversation corpus. Given these facts, investigating the perceptions of present-day native speakers is important in order to reveal the current norms of Japanese regarding the use of anata through speaker’s metalinguistic reflections. Agha (2007: 17) states:

The study of language as a social phenomenon must include the study of metalinguistic activity for a simple reason: language users employ language to categorize or classify aspects of language use, including forms of utterance, the situations in which they are used, and the persons who use them. Such reflexive classifications shape the construal of speech (and accompanying signs) for persons acquainted with them.

(Agha, 2007: 17)

In the current study, a survey was undertaken to investigate the perceptions of native speakers and this chapter presents its results. The chapter is organised as follows. Section 4.2 outlines the aims of the survey, the characteristics of the respondents and the methods of data collection and data analysis. Section 4.3 describes the results of the
survey. Sections 4.4 and 4.5 are devoted to discussions of the findings, highlighting the reasons for the avoidance of anata in Section 4.4 and discussing situational dimensions of the use of anata in Section 4.5.30

4.2 The survey

4.2.1 Aims of the survey

The aim of the survey is to identify current native speakers’ perceptions regarding the use of anata. Its focus is primarily to investigate the influence of vertical relationships in the speaker’s use of anata. The predominance of vertical relationships in the system of personal reference terms has already been discussed in the previous chapter. In this chapter, I examine this by uncovering native speakers’ metalinguistic reflections in order to ultimately help reveal the mechanisms behind the disparate views that are held about the use of anata. More specifically, through this survey, I collected the results of the following inquiries.

(1) To whom do native speakers use anata?
   (i) Do you use anata towards an addressee who is socially superior to you?
   (ii) Do you use anata towards an addressee who is socially inferior to you?
   (iii) Do you use anata towards an addressee who is socially equal to you?

(2) What are the reasons for your choice?

(3) In what kind of situations do you use anata?

30 The survey results and discussions in this chapter have been published (Yonezawa, 2016).
As noted in Chapter 1, to date, no published studies have addressed the inquiries listed above over a wide range of generations for speakers of the Tokyo-standard variety of Japanese. The survey in this study fills this gap. The results are significant for the finding of potential indicators of inherent properties of anata that can, in tandem with discourse analysis, ultimately explain the mechanisms behind the different views that are held towards the term.

4.2.2 Participants

The respondents to this survey were speakers of the Tokyo-standard variety of Japanese. In order to avoid the possible influence of different dialects, the survey was distributed to people who were born, or who moved into the area before the age of four years, and were raised in the Tokyo metropolitan area until at least sixteen years of age. Regarding the notion of the Tokyo metropolitan area, Tanaka (2010) defined it as one metropolis (Tokyo) and three surrounding prefectures (Kanagawa, Saitama and Chiba). This area is linguistically highly integrated and needs to be treated as one area in terms of language use (ibid).31 People commute from these surrounding areas to the heart of Tokyo for work and study on a daily basis. Also, those who were born in central Tokyo move out to the surrounding prefectures at different life stages.

The Tokyo standard-variety is used mainly in this area, but at the same time, it is also recognised across all of Japan as the standard-variety (Tanaka, 1991, 1996; Yasuda, 1999; Koyama, 2004). Conducting the survey in this area was crucial in order to understand the perceptions of the real users of the Tokyo standard-variety.

31 This is based on the definition of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and Communications which refers to the area within the scope of 70km from Tokyo’s 23 wards. This roughly corresponds to Tokyo and these three prefectures.
In terms of age and gender of the respondents, the table below illustrates the distribution.

(1) Distribution of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(54.9%)</td>
<td>(45.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(37.5%)</td>
<td>(62.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41.8%)</td>
<td>(58.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(44.8%)</td>
<td>(55.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(53.5%)</td>
<td>(46.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(41.7%)</td>
<td>(58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(45.1%)</td>
<td>(54.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of valid responses used in the analysis was 428 in total. Although I received more responses than this, those which did not meet the criteria for a speaker of the Tokyo standard-variety of Japanese were excluded. The target sample size is based on Brown’s (2001: 74) recommendation that a sample should include 28 or more people in each cohort. The samples in this study have at least 50 people in each age group. In order to obtain comprehensive results, the age and gender of the participants were distributed as evenly as possible. The survey was anonymous, thus all responses only use ID numbers from 1 to 428. The numbers written at the end of extracts that have been taken from the respondents’ comments and herein published are their IDs.
4.2.3. Methods of data collection

The survey is a paper-based questionnaire approved by the Ethics Committee of the Australian National University (protocol number #2013/599). It was administered during January 2014 in the Tokyo metropolitan area. Using a questionnaire format is advantageous when collecting a large number of responses in a limited time. The survey administrators visited various places where they could engage with many people at a time, such as schools, universities, public libraries, companies, shops and hair salons. People whom I initially contacted were often university staff and graduates, hence the respondents tended to be educated people. Thus, to include participants from the wider community, the initial participants organised some acquaintances in their local communities to distribute the survey and the receivers in turn did the same with further acquaintances. In this sense, it was a snowball sampling.

The questionnaire consisted of two types of items: closed-response items and open-response items (cf. Appendix). The closed-response items involved questions about whether or not the respondents would use _anata_ towards different types of addressees, in what situations they would use it and the reasons why they would avoid its use if they do not use it. To be more specific, at first, the participants were asked whether or not they would use _anata_ to an addressee who has a certain social relationship with the participants. The participants had four options; ‘I don’t use it at all’, ‘It depends on the situation’, ‘I always use it’, and ‘unknown’. ‘Unknown’ was to be chosen if a question was not applicable to a respondent (e.g. cases where a respondent did not have siblings, a spouse and so on). For each of these options, the number of responses was aggregated and converted into a percentage against the total number of responses excluding ‘unknown’. The following table illustrates the format. The survey paper

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Relationship</th>
<th>I Don’t Use It at All</th>
<th>It Depends on the Situation</th>
<th>I Always Use It</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sibling</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-family friend</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family member</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
distributed to respondents was written in Japanese including all instructions and questions.

(2) Do you use *anata* to the following addressee?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>addressee</th>
<th>I don’t use it at all</th>
<th>It depends on the situation</th>
<th>I always use it</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger relatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close friend (same sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>close friend (different sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older acquaintance (same sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older acquaintance (different sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger acquaintance (same sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger acquaintance (different sex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spouse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boss</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After answering these questions, the respondents were required to give the reasons for their choice. The list of answer options provided in the survey was generated from answers given by respondents in a pilot survey which I had conducted earlier and included all the answers given in the pilot survey. In addition, in order to avoid leading the responses by the use of these options, I also added into the list of answer options in the final version of the survey some opposing or very different expressions from those obtained in the pilot survey.
If they chose ‘not at all’, they were asked to give the reason why they avoided the use of anata, using these options: (i) It is rude, (ii) It sounds too official, (iii) It sounds too polite, (iv) It sounds too intimate, (v) It creates a distance, (vi) It is too casual, (vii) Other. If they chose ‘depends on the situation’, they were asked in what situation they would use anata. The options provided were: (i) When I argue with or criticise the listener, (ii) When I give advice to the listener, (iii) When I compliment the listener, (iv) When I want to be close/emphasise friendliness, (v) In a letter, (vi) In a formal setting (vii) Other. If a respondent chose ‘Other’ when asked for reasons and situations, he/she was asked to provide further information in his/her own words.

Answers to the above questions were input into the IBM SPSS Statistics software. This was useful for my analysis as it enabled me to see the results from different perspectives by changing variables, that is, seeing generational differences, gender differences and differences depending on types of addressees. In this study, my focus is on the influence of vertical relationships and thus I categorised addressees into ‘superior’, ‘inferior’ and ‘equal’ relative to the respondent. The results are shown in the next sections by using different generational cohorts. As anata’s pragmatic value has been changing over time (cf. Chapter 3), generational differences in speaker perceptions may be observed. In terms of gender differences, as discussed in some previous literature, several noteworthy distinctions between male and female respondents were observed. I will discuss them in the relevant sections.

With regard to the open-response item, participants were given space to write their thoughts about the usage of anata freely and in their own words. These comments were analysed qualitatively. While this part of the survey was voluntary, the majority of respondents actually provided substantial written remarks using all the available space.
These comments played a similar role to the follow-up interviews that are sometimes used in other survey methodologies. The level of active participation of the respondents possibly reflects public interest in the use of anata. In fact, the ambiguity and mystery around the usage of anata has not only been of scholarly interest but has been a continuous topic of popular discussion in the public realm and on social media in Japan, right through from the debate around the proposal of a language policy after World War II to the present day.

4.3 Results

4.3.1 The use of anata towards a superior

This section reveals the results of participants’ perceptions regarding the use of anata when used towards a superior addressee. Superiors include older members of a family and older relatives (i.e. parents, older siblings and older relatives), older acquaintances, teachers and bosses. The table below illustrates the results.

---

32 This topic will be discussed in Chapter 8.
33 For instance, NHK, a public broadcaster in Japan, has dealt with the topic “Is anata an uncomfortable word?” on NHK online (2012: http://www.nhk.or.jp/kininaru-blog/134145.html). Further, an online discussion page conducted by the Yomiuri news company, one of the largest news companies in Japan, has dealt with topics regarding the use of anata, such as “Don’t you feel uncomfortable with a person who calls others anata?” (2012: http://komachi.yomiuri.co.jp/n/2012/0415/499584.htm?o=0&p=7).
(3) Do you use ‘anata’ to an addressee who is socially superior to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Depends</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>95.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>94.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>94.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most striking aspect of these results is the overwhelming degree of avoidance of the use of anata towards a superior addressee. The majority of respondents thus acknowledged their awareness of the social norm, that the use of personal pronouns is not appropriate towards a superior addressee. As shown in Chapter 3, a speaker is expected to use occupational terms such as buchoo ‘section manager’ and sensei ‘teacher’, kinship terms such as otoosan ‘father’ and oneechan ‘older sister’ and so forth to refer to a superior. In vertical relationships, an inferior speaker tends to be more constrained in their language use and thus the social norm is typically applied. Almost no respondent answered that they would always use anata to a superior addressee. The above tendencies were observed in all generations and both genders.

This strongly norm-oriented choice is in line with Ide’s (1992a, 2006) notion of wakimae ‘discernment’. This also supports the tendency in Japanese communication, described by Hill et al. (1986), that wakimae predominates over volitional aspects of the speaker’s stylistic choice. Speakers almost automatically think they would not use anata towards a superior addressee.
That said, there are participants who reported the use of *anata* towards a superior by choosing ‘depending on the situation’, although this was a very small number of people (average 6.2%). Since I was not asking for a grammatical acceptability judgement but rather for a pragmatic appropriateness judgement, it is interesting to see this deviation from the normative usage arising. The percentage giving this answer is slightly higher among younger generations compared to people over 40. I will come back to this point later in Section 4.5.1.

### 4.3.2 The use of *anata* towards an inferior

Inferior addressees include younger siblings and relatives, younger acquaintances, and one’s own children. As a social norm, the superior tends to use an inferior’s name but the use of personal pronouns is also allowed towards an inferior addressee (cf. Chapter 3). Nevertheless, the results show that the use of *anata* does not seem frequent even towards an inferior.

(4) Do you use ‘*anata*’ to an addressee who is socially inferior to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Depends</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>56.6%</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the percentage of respondents giving the answer ‘not at all’ is lower than in the case of usage towards a superior, Table (4) shows that 67.6% of the respondents on average answered that they would never use anata towards an inferior addressee. This indicates that even though it is ‘acceptable’ in principle to use personal pronouns towards an inferior, this does not lead speakers to readily and comfortably use anata towards an inferior.

Again, the percentage of ‘always’ is very low. This indicates that, for these respondents, anata is not the default reference form towards an inferior. In collected comments, they mostly remarked that they would usually use the addressee’s name, such as first name only, last name only (in case of male speakers) or name with some suffixes such as ~chan. A group of male speakers reported they would use omae ‘you-vulgar’ when they refer to an inferior addressee.

Some tendencies of different age groups were observed. The percentage of ‘not at all’ is higher among respondents under 40 (78.7% for 10s, 83% for 20s and 73.1% for 30s) than for those over 40 (59% for 40s, 56.6% for 50s and 55.6% for 60s). Reflecting this tendency, the percentages of ‘depending on the situation’ are also higher for over 40’s than for the younger generations. The higher frequency of the situational use of anata by the participants over forty suggests the possibility that certain situations where anata is used are related to the speaker’s superiority or seniority. This point will be addressed in 4.5.2.

4.3.3 The use of anata towards an equal

This section reveals the use of anata towards an addressee of socially equal status to the speaker. Equals include friends, spouses and lovers.
(5) Do you use ‘anata’ to an addressee who is socially equal to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Depends</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10s</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20s</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30s</td>
<td>72.6%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40s</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50s</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60s</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 62.9% of respondents reported their avoidance of anata by choosing ‘not at all’. The percentage of the avoidance of anata is again tends to be higher in the younger generations compared to those over 40, although 63.6% for the 10s is lower than for the 20s and 30s. I will discuss teenagers’ comments about this point later in section 4.5.3.

Although only a few people chose ‘always’, it is noticeable that this answer is slightly higher for those over 40 and especially for the 60s (4.6% for 40s, 3.2% for 50s and 10.4% for 60s). The higher percentage is attributed to the number of wives using anata towards their husbands. Wives’ use of anata will be discussed separately in Chapter 8.

Regarding the percentage of ‘depends on the situation’ responses, an average 33.6% of the participants chose this option. Given that this number of people reported a situational use of anata, it is necessary to pay close attention to the actual situations in which these participants would use anata to a particular addressee.
4.4. Reasons for the avoidance of *anata*

The quantitative results reported above reflect several interesting facts about the use of *anata* among native speakers of Japanese. First, the term is not common as a default personal reference term regardless of a speaker’s age and gender or the status relationship between a speaker and an addressee. Second, its use is highly dependent on situational factors. This section discusses the first point, highlighting reasons why a large number of respondents avoid the use of *anata*. The second point will be discussed in 4.4.2, by highlighting the situational dimensions.

4.4.1. Towards a superior

Most respondents answered that they would never use *anata* towards a superior. Among them, the major reason was ‘because it is rude’. Observe the following comment.

> Anata wa, ue kara shita no tachiba ni iu kotoba da to omou node, toshiue no hito ni anata wa, shitsurei ni ataru to kangaeru. Gyakumi, jooshi ya sensei dado, tachiba ga ue no hito kara yobareru koto niwa, betsuni teikoo wa nai yoo ni omou. ‘I think *anata* is a word to be used from a superior to an inferior, so I regard the use of *anata* towards a senior as rude. On the other hand, I don’t think I would particularly feel uncomfortable with being referred to as *anata* from someone of higher status than me such as a boss or a teacher.’ (Respondent 117)

This explanation represents a group of speaker responses which showed that a vertical relationship was a strongly dominant factor when avoiding the use of *anata* to a superior. The central assumption of this perception is that address behavior is predicated on power/status inequality.
The above participant also remarked that he would not feel uncomfortable being referred to as *anata* by a superior. Regarding this point, however, there are a number of people who reported different opinions about this, that is, they remarked on the discomfort when being referred to as *anata* even by a superior. Thus, it is not safe to interpret the latter part of the above respondent’s comment as a common feeling.

Morford (1997: 8) points out that when investigating native speakers’ perceptions, it is important to carefully examine the speakers’ awareness of any aspect of language use as it may ‘obscure the complex social significances produced through use of the pronominal address system’ (Morford, 1977: 8). Interestingly, the high rate of avoidance of *anata* towards a superior is not patterned into a ‘because it is rude’ account. The reasons for avoidance change depending on who the superior is. If the use of *anata* is towards one’s teacher or boss, the rate of the perception that ‘it is rude’ is the highest (88%). On the other hand, the percentage decreases for older acquaintances and relatives (78%), parents (56%) and older siblings (42%). Instead, other reasons such as ‘it creates distance’ and ‘it sounds too official’ become more dominant, especially towards parents and older siblings.

This tendency shows that when official power relationships, such as student vs. teacher and employee vs. manager, are overriding between the interlocutors, the use of *anata* from an inferior to a superior tends to be perceived as ‘rude’. However, when such a power relationship is not central, such as in cases towards parents and older siblings, with some closeness being involved, the ‘rude’ perception decreases. Instead, it shifts to a feeling of distance or detachment. The participants remarked on the use of *anata* towards older family members as *tanin gyoogi* ‘standing on ceremony/being like a
stranger’ and *tsukihanasu yooda* ‘(it’s like) staying at arm’s length’ and so on, rather than describing it as *shitsurei* ‘rude’.

Given this, it is plausible to say that a vertical relationship is not the only factor in avoiding the use of *anata* when talking to a superior. In other words, it is too simplistic to interpret the results as ‘*anata* cannot be used towards a superior because it is rude’. A certain ‘distancing function’ (Takahara, 1992: 124) also leads a speaker to avoid its use.

### 4.4.2. Towards an inferior

The distancing aspect is more strongly perceived in cases where an addressee is an inferior or an equal. The majority of respondents reported that they would usually use an inferior’s name with appropriate suffixes such as ~*san*, ~*kun* and ~*chan*. Among the respondents who reported avoiding using *anata* to an inferior, only 25% stated ‘because it is rude’, that is, rudeness was not the main reason for their avoidance. Instead, 70% expressed the view that in a relationship in which they normally call an inferior by their name, the use of *anata* would create an unnecessary distance. These respondents indicated that *anata* sounded too formal, official, business-like and detached, hence it estranged an addressee. These perceptions are similar to the feelings regarding the use of *anata* towards parents and older siblings mentioned in the previous section. Observe the following comment.

*Ue no hito kara anata to iwaretemo, tsukihanasarete iru ki ga shimasu. Dakara watashi jishin wa fudan toshishita no hito nimo tsukaimasen. Shoojiki, anata wa dare ni taishite mo kyori o tsukuru kotoba no yoona ki ga shimasu.*
‘Being called *anata* even by a superior, I feel I am pushed to be at a distance. So, I don’t usually use it even towards a junior. To be honest, I feel that *anata* is a word which creates a distance towards anyone.’

(Respondent 55)

The above respondent commented that the use of *anata* distances any addressee regardless of whom they are talking to. It is a perception that the form itself inherently has a distancing property.

A group of respondents showed ambivalent feelings in that they believed that the use of *anata* was allowed towards an inferior in principle, but they had an uncomfortable feeling about actually using the form. Although they remarked that *kihonteki ni toshishita no hito ni wa tsukattemo ii n da to omoimasu* ‘as a basic rule, I think it is allowed to use (*anata*) towards an inferior’, they had a vague reluctance to use it which was difficult to explain. Some connected the avoidance of the use of *anata* to a self-presentational concern as follows.

*Anata wa ue kara shita to iu imeeji ga aru node, jibun ga tsukau to naruto, tatoe toshishita ni taishite demo, erasoo da to omowarenai ka to kangaete shimau.*

‘I have an image that *anata* is a word from a superior to an inferior, so when it comes to my own usage, I tend to be concerned about being seen as arrogant.’

(Respondent 79)

Mirroring their belief that *anata* is a word to be used from a superior to an inferior, the reason for their own avoidance of *anata* is so they stay away from a pronominal use which makes them sound ‘arrogant’. Other respondents in this group also made various comments which indicated that top-down nuances were created by the use of *anata*. These respondents used words such as *erasoo* ‘arrogant’, *uekara mesen* ‘looking down
from the upper perspective’. They expressed the view that such characteristics did not match their desired self-presentation, thus they did not use anata even towards an inferior.

To sum up, people avoid the use of anata towards an inferior because of certain negative nuances such as distancing, arrogance, being too formal, too official and business-like. Although quite a few respondents believe that it is ‘allowed’ for a superior to use anata towards an inferior, they hesitated to use it because of these nuances which they tend to inexplicably feel. It appears that anata is not a comfortable word to use even from a superior towards an inferior.

4.4.3. Towards an equal

The case of using anata towards an equal shows similar tendencies to the case where it is used toward an inferior. 62.9% of the participants reported that they would not use anata at all to an equal (cf. Table 4 in 4.3.3). Among these respondents, 72.7% reported that it was because the use of anata created a sense of detachment and distance, and bore an overly formal and official tone. These perceptions are similar to the case where a superior avoids the use of anata towards an inferior. The respondents’ comments included similar expressions such as jimuteki na kanji ‘businesslike nuance’ and yosoyososhii ‘estranging’. It appears that the symmetrical use of anata between equals is not easy and comfortable.

Example remarks taken from some of the responses indicate that equals usually call each other by their names or some other pronouns such as omae, especially between male friends, and using anata tends to feel out of place, often interpreted as estranging.
Higoro namae de yobiateiru naka no hito anata to yobikakerareru to, nanika kankei ga waruku naru yoona koto o shite shimatta kana to omou.

‘If I am called anata by someone who I usually talk to by name, it makes me think that I did something wrong which made our relationship suffer.’

(Respondent 23)

Another group of responses accounted for the feeling of distance based on the belief that anata was a formal or polite pronoun by nature and that was why it sounded too detached.

Teinei na kotoba da to wakatteiru node, gyaku ni shitashii hito kara iwareru to kyori no aru tsumetai kanji ni kikoeru.

‘I know it is a polite word, so if I am called (anata) by someone close, it sounds distant and cold.’

(Respondent 306)

Anata wa kashikomatta ba igai de tsukau to, tsukihanasetara yooni kanji, amari kimochi no ii mono dewa nai to omoimasu.

‘If anata is used outside a formal situation, it sounds like (I am) being pushed to arms’ length and I don’t really feel comfortable.’

(Respondent 63)

The belief that anata is a formal pronoun indeed exists among native speakers. In the same way that the views presented in the previous literature are contradictory, this perception contradicts the feeling that the use of anata sounds ‘rude’ which was revealed in the previous section.

While such distancing and detaching nuances are dominant regarding perceptions about the use of anata to an equal, intriguingly, a small number of participants remarked on an opposite nuance. Approximately 10% of female respondents gave their reason for avoiding using anata toward a male friend as being ‘it sounds too intimate’. A female
respondent among this group wrote hazukashikute nakanaka tsukaenai ‘I feel embarrassed and so cannot easily use it’ (Respondent 408).

More interestingly, such embarrassment does not necessarily create negative consequences. Observe the following comment from a male speaker.

Negatibu na inshoo no hoo ga ooi yooni omou. Tadashi, shitashii hito —toku ni josei —kara iwareru to kibun ga ii.
‘I feel that I have more negative impressions (regarding the use of anata). However, if being called (anata) by someone close — especially from a woman — I feel good.’

(Respondent 416)

Anata o majime ni tsukattara, yohodo foomaru na bamen de nai kagiri, kikaiteki de iwakan o oboeru. Tada, chiteki de kuuru na josei ni jitto me o minagara iwaretara, chotto ii kamoshirenai.
‘If (I use) anata seriously, unless the situation is really formal, it sounds mechanical and it feels out of place. However, if I am referred to (as anata) by a woman who is intelligent and cool and looking into my eyes, it would be sort of good.’

(Respondent 400)

The above remarks indicate that the use of anata by certain females gives these male respondents a positive feeling, but it is possibly the very reason for the female cohort avoiding the use of anata, that is, not to sound too intimate. As the comments suggest, the use of anata can create a certain intimate nuance, which is completely opposite from the nuances of distance and detachment. It seems that the use of anata not only creates a polite vs. impolite conflict but also creates a distant vs. intimate contradiction in its nuances. This suggests that across all responses, no single nuance is deemed to be a
genuine property of *anata*. To understand the nature of *anata*, it is necessary to discover an inherent property of the term that all these nuances share.

Exploring this point, it was noticeable that there was a word which the respondents frequently used in their comments. That word is *iwakan*, which indicates a sense of unsuitability or a feeling of inappropriacy. Observe the following comments.

*Fudan tomodachi to wa namae de yobaimasu. Otagai ni yoku shitteiru noni ‘anata’ o tsukau no wa iwakan ga arimasu.*

‘Usually, I and my friends address each other with our names. If I use *anata* despite the fact that we know each other very well, it would have a feeling of unsuitability (*iwakan*).’

(Respondent 256)

*Anata to nichijoo de iwareru koto ga nai node aite ga dare demo iwakan o oboeru.*

‘I’m not usually referred to as *anata*, so regardless of the conversation partner, it somewhat feels out of place (*iwakan*).’

(Respondent 1)

*Yobareru to daitai fukai ni omou ka iwakan o kanjiru ka da to omoimasu.*

‘If I am called *anata*, it would feel uncomfortable or unsuitable (*iwakan*).’

(Respondent 104)

*Yuu no honyaku nado de wa anata o tsukau ga, nihongo toshite wa iwakan ga arimasu. Ankeeto nado de wa sorehodo iwakan wa nai to omoimasu.*

‘I may use *anata* as a translation of English ‘you’ but as a Japanese, it has a feeling of unsuitability (*iwakan*). If it is used in a questionnaire or something, then I think there is not that feeling.’

(Respondent 171)
The word *iwakan* is ambiguous and does not express what kind of unsuitability it entails. It only conveys the feeling of ‘it is just not right’. The Japanese *Daijirin* dictionary (2006) explains the word as *mawari no mono tono kankei ga chiguhagu de shikkurishinai koto* ‘a relationship between an object and its surrounding elements is odd/incongruous/unsuitable and they do not match each other’. The fact that native speakers often use this word when talking about the use of *anata* in a variety of cases may mean that *iwakan* is an umbrella word to cover the various perceptions seen so far. A sense of unsuitability can explain feelings of oddly distant, oddly formal, unusually intimate and so forth. As we have seen, reasons for the avoidance of *anata* can all be based on the existence of this *iwakan*.

The feeling of *iwakan* may come from the fact that there are certain expectations in the use of language. A number of respondents commented on the expected use of personal references to acknowledge their relative social relationships with addressees. In terms of conversation, Suzuki (2007: 55) states that there are mainly two types of expectations in language use. One is based on *shakai*teki *shakudo* ‘social measurement’ and the other is based on *kobetsu no shakudo* ‘individual measurement’. The former is commonly shared by a given society, in other words, it is the norm in a society. The latter is based on how any specific individual usually talks within a particular relationship. According to Suzuki (2007), interlocutors usually carry certain expectations by which a speaker will talk in a certain way. If the utterance varies from the expectation, it creates a notable effect and is judged metalinguistically by the addressee.

Returning to the survey results, the use of *anata* was mostly excluded from default or expected terms of address in any relationship types provided in the survey. Its use
could therefore mean a deviation from expectations in most cases. Recall the norms that inferiors usually address superiors by occupational terms or kinship terms, superiors address inferiors by name, and equals call each other by name and nickname, or male friends may call each other *omae*. The use of *anata* is in most cases a breach of these expectations.

We have confirmed that an address form which was once said to be ‘standard’ is in fact far from standard and indeed appears to be highly sensitive. We wonder now why Japanese speakers ever use *anata* if its use is so sensitive. The next section will explore this point by investigating situations in which native speakers would indeed use *anata*.

### 4.5. Situational dimensions

The survey results show that participants responded in relatively high numbers for ‘depends on the situation’. This suggests that the key to understanding the use of *anata* is to look at situational factors. A group of participants insightfully remarked that the use of *anata* is closely tied to the context of a situation rather than relative social relationships between a speaker and an addressee.

*Jibun ga tsukau ka, tsukawarete teikoo o kanjiru ka nado wa, aite to no kankei yorimo sonotoki no jookyoo ni yoru to omou. Taimingu toka ni yotte mo nyuansu ga chigau.*

‘Whether or not I use it, whether or not I feel uncomfortable if I’m referred to (as *anata*), depends on the situation rather than the relationship with the addressee. The nuance is also different depending on the timing.’

(Respondent 418)
Jookyoo ni yotte, keii ni mo shitashimi ni mo iyami ni mo toreru to omoimasu. To naru to, nichijoo kaiwa de wa sentaku shizuraku, gyaku ni ‘kokoichiban’ de tsukau kotoba nano kana, to omoimashita.

‘Depending on the situation, it (the use of anata) can be regarded as respectful, intimate or nasty. If so, it is difficult to use it in daily conversations. On the other hand, I wonder if it is a word to use at a special moment.’

(Respondent 129)

The quantitative results in the previous sections and the above comments reveal some problems in previous studies regarding the use of anata. Their accounts have been based on the notion that Japanese pronominal address behaviour largely reflects a static order of social relationships between speakers and addressees. The survey results dispute this notion and suggest the importance of situational factors. The following sub-sections will discuss situational dimensions in which anata may be used towards a variety of addressees.

4.5.1. Towards a superior

As we have seen earlier, the use of anata towards a superior is largely avoided. Only a small number of respondents chose ‘depends on the situation’. However, their answers indicated an interesting fact. Among the respondents who chose ‘depends’, the most common answer was ‘when arguing with or criticising the addressee’ (63% of respondents who answered ‘depends on the situation’). Observe the following comment.

Amari ishiki shita koto wa nakatta desu ga, joogekankei no shita kara ue e tsukau koto ga aru to shitara, kenka goshi no baai toiu mono ga aru kamoshirenai to omoimasu.
‘I’ve hardly been conscious (of the use of *anata*), but if there is a situation where an inferior uses it towards a superior in a vertical relationship, I think it might be almost like a fighting situation.’

(Respondent 54)

While the use of *anata* is normally unacceptable from an inferior to a superior, it appears that in conflict situations the use of *anata* is possible. In other words, when one uses *anata* to a superior, it can be seen as an ‘unusual situation’ such as a quarrel between interlocutors. Considering this, it may be used as a strategic language tool in situations where explicit verbal impoliteness or aggressiveness is intended. In fact, past studies have pointed out that the use of *anata* from an inferior to a superior has been observed in contentious situations (Hashiguchi, 1998; Miwa, 2000, 2005; Kanai, 2002; Kim, 2012; Shimotani, 2012; Yonezawa, 2014).

Here, it is useful to restate a typical example of this case seen in Chapter 2 in order to illustrate such a situation. It is Kanai’s (2003a) example from a novel. The following is a conversation between student Kato and his teacher Kagemura. Before this extract, the narrative tells of the student’s anger towards his teacher.

(6) *Kato wa jibun no kao no hotette iku no o kanjite ita. Ikari ga kao ni dete kita no dearu.*

‘Kato felt his face burning. His anger was starting to express itself.’

Kato: *Ittai anata wa naze watashi ni sonna koto o at.all 2PP: anata TOP why 1PP DAT such thing OBJ tazuneru n desu?* ask NOM BE

‘Why do you (*anata*) ask me such a thing?’
Kagemura: *Anata* da to?

2PP: *anata* BE QT

‘*You (anata)*?’

*Kagemura wa mutto shita yoo na kao de itta. Sensei to iwazuni anata to itta koto ga Kagemura ni wa fuyukai ni omoeta ni chigainai.*

‘Kagemura said, as if he were in a bad temper. The fact that (Kato) did not call him sensei ‘teacher’ but *anata* must have offended him.’


The example shows a use of *anata* which does not comply with normative address behaviour. In this case, social norms require and expect the student’s use of *sensei* ‘teacher’ towards his teacher. Instead, the student uses *anata* and consequently offends his teacher. This was the reason for Kanai’s (2003a) claim that *anata* was an impolite pronoun.

Recall the fact that the percentage for ‘depends’ in the 10s and 20s age groups was slightly higher than for older generations (cf. Table (3) in 4.3.1). This can be attributed to the situations they can find themselves in, as revealed in their further responses ‘when I argue with or criticise parents and teachers’ (this was a response by 71% of those who said that it ‘depends on the situation’ whether they use *anata* to their parents and teachers). The arguing/criticising response was also observed among male respondents over 40 more so than females of the same generation. In these cases, the male respondents referred to situations related to conflict with their bosses (this was a response by 83% of male respondents over 40 who had said that it ‘depends on the situation’ whether they use *anata* towards their bosses). It is interesting to see this similarity between teenagers’ and front-line male workers’ use of *anata* towards particular superior addressees.
To sum up, since the use of *anata* towards a superior can be regarded as a breach of the social norm, then situations where *anata* would be used are unusual cases. Native speakers typically associate the use of *anata* towards a superior with a conflict situation. In such situations, acknowledgement of the relative social relationship between the interlocutors would not be the speaker’s main concern. The use of *anata* appears to be possible or useful to reflect the speaker’s feeling in these cases.

### 4.5.2. Towards an inferior

For the case where *anata* is used towards an inferior, among those who chose ‘depends on the situation’, the most frequent answer regarding possible situations for using *anata* was when the speakers give advice, admonition or make evaluative comments. This response was especially frequent in stating when parents would use *anata* to their children (67% on average, 76% for over 40s).

> Anata to tsukau toki wa, kiwamete ishikiteki ni tsukihanashitai toki, aruiwa okotteiru toki, gakkarishiteiru toki, sore o aite ni wakatte moraitakute tsukaimasu. Desukara, kodomo tachi mo sore o chokkan de wakatteite, ‘Anatatachi…’ to iu to, ‘A, hajimatta hajimatta…’ to faasuto suteeji de torae masu. Osekkyoo da to handan shi, chotto teishuku na taido de kikimasu. ‘If I use *anata* to my children, it would be when I very consciously keep a certain distance, am angry or disappointed with them and want them to understand it. So, when I use *anata*, my children probably know that intuitively. When I go ‘Anata tachi…’ , they would go ‘Oops, here we go, it started…’ as a first stage. Then they judge that I am about to scold them. So they turn to listen to me with a slightly obedient attitude.’

(Respondent 176)
The above comment suggests that this kind of situation is an irregular moment between the parent and her children. Parents would normally call their children by their names and in doing so, they acknowledge their relationship via verbal communication. The above comment suggests that the use of anata here implies a shift in their conversation, moving it to a ‘special’ moment. In this case, it is when the mother scolds her children.

Some comments from school teachers also demonstrated a similar aspect.

*Shikaru toki ni namae dewa naku anata o tsukatte iru koto ga aru.*

‘I sometimes use anata when I tell pupils off.’

(Respondent 103)

The following comment is an example from a violin teacher recollecting her use of anata.

*Fudan wa seito o namae de yobimasu ga, ressun no toki wa yoku ‘Anata no ima no oto wa ne…’ nado to itteiru yoo ni omoimasu. Chiisai kodomo ni mo desu. Nande deshoo ne.*

‘I usually use students’ names to address them but I think I often switch it to anata during my lessons saying, for example, anata no ima no oto wa ne… “Your (anata no) sound just now is…”’. I wonder why.’

(Respondent 410)

Reflecting this sort of situation, the following comment is an example from the perspective of a child and a student.

*Ryooshin, tokuni haha kara ‘anata’ to iwareru toki wa shikaraceru toki deshoo ka. Kyooju kara wa myooji de yobarete imasu ga, ‘anata’ to yobareru toki wa, hyooka ya ronbun o mite kudasaru toki nado, sukoshi kashikomatta yoono sooju hanashi no toki ni tsukawarete ita yoo ni omoimasu.*
'When I am called anata by my parents, especially my mother, it would probably be when I am told off. My professor calls me by my surname but when I am called anata, I think it is something like when I am being evaluated or s/he checks my thesis etc. I feel that it is used when a topic is a little bit formal or something like that.'

(Respondent 94)

Regarding this point, I have found that in the ordinary conversations in the data set of this study (cf. Chapter 1), one particular conversation shows a higher frequency of occurrence of anata compared to the rest of the conversations. In this conversation, a university professor is giving advice to his student regarding her thesis. The above participant’s (94) comment neatly reflects this tendency.

Earlier, I showed that to the question ‘Do you use anata towards an inferior?’, the answer ‘depends on the situation’ from respondents over 40 was higher than those under 40 (cf. Section 4.3.2, table (4)). I mentioned that this may be related to their social superiority due to their age. Given the situational tendencies where anata appears to be used, such as giving advice, admonition and evaluation, it makes sense that the older generations are more prone to using anata than the younger generations because they understandably tend to encounter such situations more often than younger generations.

Some gender differences were observed here. On average, more female participants chose ‘depends on the situation’ (38%) than did male speakers (25%). To break it down, a notable difference was found between males and females in their 40’s and 50s. That is, 75% of female respondents in their 40s and 50s reported that they would use anata to their own children depending on the situation, whereas only 31% of male respondents in the same generation chose the same answer. Giving children advice and
admonition exemplified in the above remark (94) appears to be a mother’s tendency rather than a father’s.

If we only look at the differences in the percentages between male and female speakers in these generations, we could fall into the simplistic interpretation that ‘middle-aged female speakers use anata more frequently than male speakers’. It is important that an interpretation like this does not mislead us into discussing this phenomenon as a matter of inherent gender difference in language use, suggesting that the use of anata is associated with female speech or womanliness. Since I have made the connection between the usage of anata and situational factors described above, we are able to be more careful with this interpretation.34

In line with this approach, it is also possible to interpret participant impressions of anata such as erasoo ‘arrogant’, uekara mesen ‘looking down from the upper perspective’ and tsukihanasu ‘keep at arm’s length’ as reflective of the situations they tend to be in. In other words, participants who made these comments may have recollected situations in which they were evaluated or told off by a superior with the use of anata, hence they associate the form with these situations. This aspect possibly led to the claim in the previous literature that anata’s property is the holding of epistemic primacy by the speaker (Shimotani, 2012).

On the whole, the aforementioned situations where a superior uses anata instead of using an inferior’s normal reference terms are special moments in conversations.

---

34 Regarding this point, mothers’ much longer hours of involvement in child raising relative to fathers’ in Japan has been reported and compared to international standards (Inaba, 1998; Mizuochi, 2006). It may be the case that if a mother spends much more hours with her children, she would tend to encounter more situations in which she tells her children off, teaches something or gives advice. As a result, they would tend to recollect more of these situations than fathers would.
When a speaker gives advice and evaluation, acknowledgment of expected relationships may be momentarily put aside and the speaker tends to keep a certain distance. Anata is seemingly useful in such cases. The fact that the use of anata is often perceived as distancing an inferior is possibly a flip side of the fact that its use is suitable for situations of giving advice, admonition and evaluation.

4.5.3. Towards an equal

For the use of anata towards an equal (as noted earlier ‘equal’ in this survey includes friends, spouses and lovers), differences in the percentage of answers across given options are not as sharp as in the use of anata towards a superior or an inferior. However, a certain tendency was nevertheless shown. Among those who said they would use anata towards an equal ‘depending on the situation’, 40.4% selected the situation for using it as ‘when I want to be close/emphasise friendliness’. This was more frequent than for those who used it towards a superior or an inferior. (15% of respondents who stated that, depending on the situation, they would use anata towards a superior said that they would use it ‘when I want to be close’. Similarly, 15.7 % of respondents who said they would use anata towards an inferior depending on the situation, answered that they would use it ‘when I want to be close’). Comments around its use included things such as ‘when paying a compliment’ or ‘joking with each other’.

‘I sometimes use it between friends. I use it towards someone with whom we can make fun of each other. ‘You eat a lot’ and ‘You are amazing’ etc.’

(Respondent 93)
Among participants in their 10’s and 20’s, almost half of them remarked that they would use \textit{anata} when joking together or poking fun at each other.

Equals would normally call each other by names and nicknames, or male friends may call each other with some vulgar address pronouns such as \textit{omae}. These terms are an acknowledgement of their equal status and friendship. In the survey results, \textit{anata} appeared not to be a default address form between equals in most cases. This means that again, situations where the use of \textit{anata} does occur can be regarded as special cases. It appears that the use of \textit{anata} is suitable at special moments like those indicated above, namely, playing with each other verbally. In the above comment by Respondent 93, phrases such as \textit{anata yoku taberu nee} ‘you eat a lot’ could be regarded as criticism made in a teasing manner. This type of talk might be perceived as ‘friendliness’ and thus expressed as such in their answer, rather than categorising it as criticism. In the daily conversations in the data set of the current study, among the small number of occurrences of \textit{anata}, the following conversation was observed between female students. In (7), female students are talking about how to go back to their hometowns during the holiday.

(7) A: \textit{Watashi mo yooka ni Hikari de kaeru}.

1PP also 8\textsuperscript{th} on Hikari by return

‘I will also go back on 8\textsuperscript{th} by Hikari bullet train.’

B: \textit{Shinkansen ka, kono kanemochi}.

bullet.train QUE this rich.person

‘Bullet train? This rich woman.’

A: (laugh) \textit{Nani yo, anata, nan de kaeru noyo}.

what SFP 2PP: anata what by return SFP

‘(laugh) What? By what will \textbf{you (anata)} go back then?’
B: (laugh) *Ko, koosoku basu.*

FL express bus

‘(laugh) Ex.....express bus.’

A: (laugh) *Gambatte kudasai* (laugh).

good.luck

‘(laugh) Good luck.’

(C104)

In this conversation, when B calls A a ‘rich woman’ because A will use the expensive bullet train, A was offended by being labeled this way. The start of A’s second utterance *nani yo anata* ‘what? you (anata)...’ is a common initial phrase used to pick a fight and hence has a challenging tone. However, both A and B are having this conversation with laughter, thus this is a mock conflict. This type of use of *anata* may be what the survey respondents expressed as a ‘friendly’ and ‘joking’ way to use the term.

Some respondents mentioned a vague impression they had that older women tended to use *anata* more often than male speakers when talking to friends. This vague impression was attested to by closely look at the results by gender. It was revealed that for the 50s and 60s groups, more female speakers chose ‘depends’ for using *anata* towards an equal (50s: 54% female vs. 28% male, 60s: 43% female vs. 33% male). Observe the following comment from a woman in her 60s on her use of *anata* towards female friends.

*Shitashimi o shimesu toki, wakai hito dato, namae ya nikku-neemu o tsukattari suru no kamo shiremasen ga, chuukoonen ni naruto, sore mo chotto kodomoppoi ki ga suru shi, anta da to ramboo dashi, toiu koto de, anata ga choodo ii ki ga suru no kamo shiremasen.*
‘To show friendliness, young people may use names and nicknames but when (we) become middle/old aged, that feels a little childish (for us) but using ‘anta’ is vulgar, so, the use of anata may feel quite right.’

(Respondent 411)

This woman is expressing that the use of anata can add a hint of friendliness when used among the older female generation, without being too childish and too vulgar. The unavailability of the masculine term omae ‘you’ for female speakers in informal situations may also contribute to this.

This respondent also mentioned that the use of anata reminded her fondly of a famous female TV personality Tetsuko Kuroyanagi. Kuroyanagi is an actress and a TV talk show host and is also known as a UNICEF Goodwill Ambassador internationally. Born in 1933, she is now in her 80s. Kuroyanagi is regarded as a person who has contradicted the image of the obedient and wifely women in Japan. There is a well-known book about her childhood and so it is also well known that from an early stage in her life, she has never been a typically traditional Japanese girl.

_Totto-chan_, as she was called by her parents (a symphony orchestra concertmaster and a trained opera singer), did not grow up like other Japanese in a rigid school system. At 6, she became an ochikobore—a dropout—after being branded a ‘bad influence’ by her teacher and asked to leave. Totto-chan’s misdeed: staring out the classroom window. “If I hadn’t been removed from that school,” insists Tetsuko, “my character would have been totally different. I would have learned to obey without asking any questions.” Her mother moved her to a progressive school held in six abandoned railroad cars and presided over by a maverick principal who mixed handicapped and normal children, let his pupils study subjects in whatever order they wanted, and encouraged them to swim in the nude.

(Condon, 1981: 83)
She studied theatre in New York, has never been married, built a career as a TV personality and as mentioned, worked internationally for UNICEF. On the whole, her public image is that of an unconventional woman.

Since 1976, Kuroyanagi has been hosting a talk show *Tetsuko no Heya* ‘Tetsuko’s Room’. In a number of interviews with various people, ranging from famous actors to politicians, she maintains a consistent attitude towards guests, regardless of the guests’ age and social status. Tetsuko’s speech style is generally polite to all guests, but very friendly rather than formal. In terms of the use of *anata*, its frequent use by her has been reported in a previous study (Lee and Yonezawa, 2008).

In order to analyse the friendly tone associated with Tetsuko’s use of *anata*, I now return to my findings. I have shown so far that the use of *anata* is in most cases a deviation from the use of expected reference terms. Most importantly, *anata* tends to be used in situations where the acknowledgement of relative social status between interlocutors is not the speaker’s main concern. In this way, it makes sense that the use of *anata* characteristically matches the image of Kuroyanagi, who is uniquely unconventional and who would not consider the acknowledgement of social status to be of prime importance.

### 4.6. Summary

This chapter has explored Japanese native speakers’ perceptions of the use of *anata*. The findings are summarised as follows.

First, *anata* is not regarded as a regular personal reference term, regardless of the interlocutors’ relative social status. While the influence of a vertical relationship was strongly observed in the respondents’ avoidance of *anata* towards a superior addressee,
especially towards an official authority such as teacher or boss, the rate of avoidance was also high towards an inferior and towards an equal.

Second, the reasons for the avoidance of the term varied depending on the addressee. Its use is perceived mostly as rude towards official authorities such as teachers and bosses, but is regarded as too business-like, distancing and detached when used towards close superiors, inferiors and equals. There is also another perception among a small number of female speakers that its use sounds too intimate to refer to male friends. As with previous studies which have indicated different views about the use of *anata*, these native speakers’ perceptions towards its use are also complex and disparate. A sense of *iwakan* ‘unsuitability’ was often mentioned by the respondents corresponding to the rare use of *anata* as a regular reference term. In most cases, the use of *anata* is a deviation from the norm. As a result, its use tends to create a special nuance.

Third, respondents reported cases where *anata* would be used, such as when fighting or arguing with a superior, when giving advice and evaluation towards an inferior and when they want to be closer towards an equal. These situations are seemingly dissimilar. However, they do share an aspect that the acknowledgement of the given usual relationship is not the speaker’s priority. In other words, *anata* tends to be avoided when acknowledgement of interlocutors’ social status and expected social relationship is important, while it can occur in situations where such an acknowledgement is not the speaker’s main concern or the speaker wants to eliminate a given social relationship from the conversation.

These results suggest that the inherent properties of *anata* do not include being polite or impolite, distant or intimate. Given this, and through the discourse analysis provided in the following chapters, I argue that the peculiarity of *anata* is in its very
nature of ‘not displaying any social elements or an expected relative relationship between a speaker and an addressee’. In this sense, *anata* is a unique personal pronoun in Japanese where personal reference terms inevitably display the social relationship between interlocutors. In the remainder of the thesis, I will show evidence of this peculiar characteristic and attempt to systematically explain the mechanism of how *anata* is able to create multiple nuances in a given socio-cultural context.
Chapter 5

Absolute specification
in a socially undefinable relationship

5.1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, I suggested that the inherent properties of anata do not include any of the following: being polite, being impolite, being distant, or being intimate. Instead, I proposed that the peculiarity of anata is actually its ability to not display any social elements of the interlocutors. Here I use the notion of ‘absolute specification’, and provide a framework for the analysis presented in the following chapters.

In this chapter, I first define the term ‘absolute specification’ before discussing the issues associated with seeing address behaviour in Japanese only in relation to the static order of socially typified relationships. This is addressed in Section 5.2. Based on this discussion, I categorise relationships into two broad categories, namely, socially ‘undefinable’ relationships and socially ‘definable’ relationships. This chapter will analyse the first category and the next chapter will deal with the second category.

Further, I divide the first category into three cases. In Section 5.3, I analyse the case where anata is used to address a general audience. Section 5.4 will examine the case where anata is used to refer to a non-specific individual, broadly speaking, the impersonal use of anata in certain environments. Section 5.5 deals with the case where anata is used towards an unfamiliar but actual addressee.
5.2. Absolute specification of the second person

The term ‘absolute specification’ was first proposed by Lee (2002) in his study of the ‘zero particle’. It is used to explain the grammatical function of the zero particle, in the sense that “the speaker specifies an object or event represented by the noun phrase (NP), without referring to other objects/events” (Lee, 2002: 662). To be more specific, “the zero particle does not mark any particular case status”. Thus, in Lee’s study, the term absolute specification is used to mean that the zero particle specifies the preceding NP absolutely without indicating the logical relationship of the NP with the predicate or any other NPs.

I use this term in my analysis to mean that the use of *anata* specifies the second person entity absolutely without displaying any of the addressee’s social elements in relation to the speaker, and hence no social relationship between the speaker and the addressee is overtly specified. Put differently, *anata* is not used to indicate the social relationship of the addressee to the speaker. The essential implication of this articulation is to recognise the socially inert nature of *anata*. Note that I use ‘social relationship’ to describe a relationship that is typically identifiable in a socially expected way. Numerous relationships are included in this category such as kin relations, teacher-student relations, friends, lovers, shop staff-customer relations and so on.

We have already seen that a fundamental feature of the system of personal reference in Japanese is to indicate a certain socially typified relationship between the speaker and the addressee. For example, referring to older members of one’s family with kinship terms such as *otoosan* ‘father’ and *oniisan* ‘older brother’ inevitably displays their kin relations. In the same way, the use of occupational or position titles to refer to one’s superior, such as *kachoo* ‘section manager’, indexes their status relationships.
Male friends may call each other *ore* ‘I’ and *omae* ‘you’ to express their informal relationship as friends. In the previous studies, this aspect of the system has also been unquestioningly applied to discussions about the use of *anata*.

In the current study, however, I argue that the display of typified social relationships is absent in *anata* and that its inherent nature is in fact the non-display of interlocutors’ social elements when referring to the second person. This contradicts the general understanding of personal reference terms in Japanese and that is why *anata* has been perceived as a unique pronoun. The attempt to define *anata* as polite/formal, impolite, distant or intimate is in fact an unconsciously tangential discussion of its expressive effects. Therefore, in this study I have investigated this core property of *anata* and how it interacts with culturally governed contextual factors.

In terms of relationships, the assumption in the previous literature is that address behaviour is based only on the static order of role-based social relationships. This view overlooks other relationships which do not fit the order. The given social relationships are indeed a prototypical parameter in Japanese communication, based on which one’s stylistic choice is generally made. However, there are other relationships that are not simply definable as parent-child, teacher-student, supervisor-subordinate, friendship, lovers and so forth. In this chapter, I investigate these socially undefinable relationships.

In socially definable relationships, the use of appropriate norm-governed terms is important in Japanese communication (cf. Chapter 3). On the other hand, when the interlocutors’ relationship is undefinable, the speaker is not required to use particular expected terms to refer to the addressee, or, in fact, there cannot be expected terms. Thus, absolute specification of the second person without displaying any social elements of interlocutors is less restricted and rather suitable in certain cases. I will show that because
anata has the property of absolute specification, it tends to occur when referring to a second person whose relationship to the speaker is not definable in typical ways. This will also explain why anata appears in particular contexts and genres.

5.3. Referring to a general audience

One case where the relationship between speaker and addressee may be undefinable is when the addressee is a general audience. Anata is commonly observed in this case. It is found in a variety of sources such as questionnaires, certificates and advertisements. I discuss examples in this section drawn from advertisements which were collected during my fieldwork in Japan in January 2014. They are mostly posters found in the Tokyo Metropolitan Area and advertisements out of major newspapers. Some were found on the internet, such as on company websites. The use of anata in these advertisements is very common to the extent that one can easily find them in everyday life. Observe the following two examples.

(1)  
*Anata*  wa  *dandan  tabetakuma-ru~.*
2PP: *anata*  TOP  gradually  come.to.feel.like.eating
‘You (*anata*) are gradually going to feel like eating.’
(McDonald’s advertisement, 2014)

(2)  
*Hon-zuki no  anata ni  todoketai  kono  issatsu.*
book.lover  LK 2PP: *anata* DAT  want.to.deliver  this  a.copy
‘This one copy is for *you* (*anata*) who is a book lover.’
(Koodansha advertisement, 2014)

Example (1) is a phrase from a poster for McDonalds Japan. In terms of its target audience, it is difficult to narrow down the audience’s social elements based on the use
of *anata*. It is used to address a broad range of people, including male/female, young/old, students/business people and so forth. The use of *anata* does not imply any particular social characteristics of the addressee. Any viewer can feel that the message is directed towards him/her.

Cong and Aoki (2011) state that the managers of each McDonald’s shop in Japan are expected to provide an environment fulfilling the requirements of any social group of customers. Their customers are regarded as *roonyakunannyo* ‘young and old, male and female’. McDonald’s is depicted as being welcoming to families with children (Nihon Keizai Shimbun, 06/02/2014) as well as elderly people (Hochi Shimbun, 25/03/2015). It is appropriate that a company which has such a target market makes use of the term *anata* in its posters, whereby it does not target a specific group of customers but rather a general audience whose social elements are not narrowed down. Native speakers of Japanese would intuitively feel that the use of *anata* is suitable here.

Likewise, the target audience in example (2) is interpreted to be a wide range of people. This phrase is from an advertisement on the website of one of the major Japanese publishers, Kodansha, where the staff of the publisher recommend the best twenty books to a general audience. The recommended books are not in any particular categories. They include a variety of books such as comic books, which may be particularly popular amongst teenagers, detective stories, business success stories, literature and others. It is apparent that the publisher wants to appeal to a wide range of prospective buyers. The use of *anata* again works well to reference a wide audience and is appropriate for this advertisement.

The effect of the use of *anata* in examples (1) and (2) (namely, inclusively addressing a broad general audience) is served by *anata’s* key property, the absolute
specification of the second person. If any other terms were used, they could entail certain social elements and the target audience of the message would become more specific. Compare examples (1) and (2) with the following example (3), which includes another second person pronoun *kimi* ‘you’.

(3) *Tsuyoku nare. Juku wa *kimi* o tsuyoku suru.*

‘Be strong. The cram school makes *you* (*kimi*) strong.’

(Kawaijuku advertisement, 2012)

*Juku* is a type of private tutoring school, a so-called cram school which many pre-tertiary students regularly attend outside their normal schools, aiming to improve their grades and thus enter good universities. Example (3) is a catch phrase in an advertisement for a *juku*. The advertised courses are for prospective junior and senior high school students. *Kimi* is an informal second person pronoun used either between equals or from a superior speaker to an inferior addressee in an informal situation (cf. Chapter 3). The use of *kimi* in (3) creates a certain effect, making it sound as if the message is from the teachers or staff of the cram school and directed towards its students. That is to say, that by the use of *kimi*, the message is understood as being addressed towards young prospective students of the school. The sender of the message is intuitively aware of this effect and skillfully uses *kimi* to appeal to the targeted students.

Morita (1989) mentions the use of *anata* towards a general audience in *Kiso Nihongo Jiten* ‘Dictionary of Basic Japanese’. He points out that when *anata* is used towards a general audience, this *anata* is akin to ‘everyone’ and it does not index superior-inferior relationships. Morita (1989: 67) views *anata* in this case as ‘colourless’.
Although Morita’s (1989) view is insightful, he limits this ‘colourless’ use of *anata* only to this particular situation of addressing a general audience. I argue that *anata* is inherently colourless and the notion of ‘absolute specification’ is coherent with what Morita expresses as ‘colourless’.

One may wonder if *anata* can in fact be replaced by *minasan* ‘everyone’ or why plural forms are not used to refer to a general audience here. Interestingly, it is difficult to find advertisements in which these terms are used. Regarding this, a comment from an actual copywriter is insightful. The copywriter working for an advertising company in Tokyo created a poster about traffic safety for the Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department (Yomiuri Shimbun, 26/10/1976). The following example is the catch phrase of the poster.

(4) *Nani yori mo, anata no tame no kootsuu anzen.*

what more than 2PP: *anata* LK for LK traffic safety

‘More than anything, traffic safety is for you (*anata)*.’

(Tokyo Metropolitan Police Department, 1976)

In an interview about the poster with the newspaper, the copywriter stated that in the past, messages in posters by the Police Department had not really been apprehended as being an issue for each and every individual. Thus, he wanted a phrase conveying a message that would reach each individual in the sense that anyone looking at the poster would feel that the message is directed towards him/her. He stated that *anata* as a singular form was the only word that he thought would be appropriate (Yomiuri Shimbun, 27/10/1976). Although referring to a general audience, the singularity of the
second person pronoun *anata* has the ability to appeal to an individual. *Minasan* ‘everyone’ does not have this ability.

In the same way, the use of plural forms would also preclude the ability to send a direct message to each individual. Further, the plural forms would result in entailing certain social information about the addressee. In Japanese, plural forms of personal reference terms are made by adding suffixes to the end of the term. In the case of *anata*, the suffixes –*tachi* or –*gata* can be used. *Anatatachi* and *anatagata* are both second person plural forms. Between the two, the suffix –*gata* has a higher degree of formality and is hence used with a somewhat more respectful nuance than *anatatachi* (Morita, 1989). As for –*tachi*, because it does not carry any respectful nuance (Morita, 1989), *anatatachi* cannot be used to refer to a group of people to whom the speaker should show respect. Given these facts, the use of the plural form *anatagata* or *anatatachi* would result in providing a certain social placedness and would narrow down the possible group of addressees. Clearly this is not desirable when aiming to address a broad range of people. It is only the singular *anata* which has the property of absolute specification and hence serves to refer to any individual as a pure second person entity.

### 5.4. Impersonal use of *anata*

In the previous section, I showed that *anata* may be used to refer to a general audience. In this section, I will demonstrate the case where *anata* is used to refer to an impersonal referent that is conceptually equivalent to ‘one’, ‘someone’ or ‘everyone’.

It is well known that there are impersonal uses of personal pronouns in languages such as English and Chinese (Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990). Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 753) claim a typological pattern as follows.
The extension of the 2nd person pronoun to an impersonal is possible only in languages with small, closed pronoun sets.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 753)

They go on to state that the above pattern places languages such as Chinese, English, French, German, Arabic, Modern Hebrew, Hindi-Urdu, Italian and Persian (Farsi) among those which are able to possibly employ an impersonal use of the second person pronoun. All the languages listed above have a closed set of personal pronouns and the use of them serves primarily as person-deixis.

Focusing on English, Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 742) point to two generalised usages of you that are distinct from referential uses which identify specific individuals. One is an ‘impersonal’ use which “applies to anyone and/or everyone”. The other is a ‘vague’ use which “applies to specific individuals, but they are not identified, or identifiable, by the speaker”. Observe these English examples from Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 741).

(5) But I have a gift for teaching ... Plus, teaching fiction writing is a lot like writing. You have to examine manuscripts, use your mind, come up with possibilities, respond to characters in situations. In a lot of ways, it’s like working on your own work.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 741)

(6) You’re – I don’t mean you personally – you’re going to destroy us all in a nuclear war.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 743)
In (5), *you* and *your* do not refer to the listener, that is, it is not the interviewer who has to ‘examine manuscripts’ and to ‘use mind’. The speaker is expressing that anyone who teaches fiction has to do so (Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990). This is a typical example of the impersonal *you* in English. Example (6) is the ‘vague’ *you*. A European woman is talking to the interviewers about American political and military policy in Europe. *You* in this example refers vaguely to the American military. Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) make distinctions between impersonal *you* and vague *you* in English in that impersonal *you* can be replaceable with *one* or *we* without changing the informational content of the text, while vague *you* cannot.

Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) also point out that impersonal *you* typically occurs in a present tense context in an utterance, expressing some generalisation of ‘what life is like’ in Yule’s (1982: 320) words or what Goldsmith and Woisetschlaeger (1982: 81) describe as “knowledge of the structure of the world”. Observe the following examples from a football player’s comments in a newspaper report, cited in Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 748).

(7) Greathouse said he felt some obligation as Adam’s replacement. “The past three games, our running game has been a major factor. So I knew I had to gain some yards. I had to perform,” Greathouse said. “It’s not pressure. You keep it in your mind; you know you have to do it. Out there, you don’t think about it. You just go play by play.” (The Arizona Daily Star, September 28, 1986: p. E-4)

(Cited in and italics by Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 748))

Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 748) state that this is a structural knowledge description “in which the speaker, as an acknowledged insider, gives his account of what happens to any good football player in a game”.
They further point out that there is a type of impersonal ‘life drama’ you, as seen in the following example.

(8) You’re going down the highway, you’re having a wonderful time, singing a song, and suddenly – You get into an argument.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 748)

In sentences (8), the discourse with impersonal you is in the progressive mode except for the ‘resolution’ or ‘turn of event’ which is in the present tense. Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) state that this ‘life drama’ type occurs in ‘scene setting’ using a progressive mode, and its ‘resolution’ portion uses the present tense. What they mean by calling it a ‘life drama’ type is explained as follows.

[T]hey may constitute a flavor of a life drama episode that is potentially applicable to anyone at all. And it is this universally applicable life drama set-up that presumably sanctions the occurrence of these impersonal you’s to begin with.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 750)

The generalised use of second person pronouns is also observed in Chinese. Chao (1968) and Biq (1991) claim usages of the Chinese Mandarin ni similar to the English you seen above. The following example (9)\(^{35}\) is a typical impersonal use of Mandarin ni.

(9) Nei-xie xiao haizi nao de jiao ni bu neng zhuaxin
that-PL small child make.noise RST CUS 2PP NEG can concentrate

\(^{35}\) Representation of Chinese scripts and English gloss in example (8) follows Biq’s (1991: 309) citation from Chao (1968: 648-649). In Chao’s original, a different way of scripting the sentence was used. Abbreviations used in Biq’s example sentence are as follows: CUS (causative), PL (plurality), RST (resultative complement marker), M (measure word).
zuo shi.
do thing
‘Those children make such a noise, it makes you (me, one) unable to concentrate on your (my, one’s) work.’


According to Biq, as with the English impersonal you, the referent of ni in (9) is you, me and indeed anyone, and it is thus seen as an impersonal use of a second personal pronoun.

Further, Biq (1991: 310ff) points to the existence of the generalised use of ni in what he calls ‘dramatic ni’. As shown earlier, Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) demonstrated a ‘life drama’ type of impersonal you in English. Biq’s ‘dramatic ni’ in Mandarin appears in quotations. Interestingly, although they appear in different grammatical structures, the life drama type of you and the dramatic ni both similarly present an event as something which could commonly or generally happen to anyone. Biq (1991: 311) extracts the following example.36

(10) 1 F: Dangran zhe limian you yi ge wenti jiu shi, eh.
of course this inside have one M problem just is eh
2 youde ren ne ta keyi jueda fanzheng wo ye de. some people SFP 3PP may feel anyway 1PP also have.to
3 fen liangshi ta jiu: bu haohao ganhuo zhei ge jiu share food 3PP then NEG well work this M then
4 dei kao: sixiang jiaoyu, bu bu neng kao. have.to depend thought education NEG NEG can depend
5 qiangpuo ye bu neng: kao yi zhong: weixie de banfa. force also NEG can depend one M threaten NOM way

36 The format is adjusted to the way this study presents examples.
In example (10) above, the first *ni* and the second *ni* in line 6 are referring to someone who does not want to work hard, not the addressee in the discourse situation. Biq (1991) argues that in this example, the speaker has given up their own viewpoint and instead uses the voice of another character in the scenario. He further states as follows.

[I]n the dramatic use, the speaker loses his/her own point of view temporarily. During the story impersonation, s/he is, in fact, not describing what s/he is talking about, but rather *acting* it out. The dramatic use of *ni* is found more frequently in spoken language than in written language, probably due to the different degrees of spontaneity allowed in these types of discourse.

(Biq, 1991: 313)

Although dramatic *ni* appears in quotations in the example above and hence structurally in a different position from impersonal *ni*, Biq (1991) points out that the distinction between impersonal *ni* and dramatic *ni* is not clear-cut. Indeed, all the generalised uses of second person pronouns shown thus far in this section share a fundamental characteristic. While Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) distinguish impersonal *you* and vague
you, and Biq (1991) distinguishes impersonal *ni* and dramatic *ni*, these pronouns share the characteristic by which they are able to indicate that a described story is a general and common phenomenon which could occur or be applicable to anyone. The deictic shift which causes the pronouns to refer to a generalised person creates story generalisation.

Keeping this in mind, we now look at the impersonal use of *anata* with Japanese examples. I use the term ‘impersonal’ in a broad sense in that the referent of the second person pronoun is not a specific individual who is identifiable, so the term ‘impersonal’ covers all the usages in the examples we have seen so far, whether they are impersonal, vague or dramatic as described in Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) and Biq (1991). Kitagawa and Lehrer themselves used the phrase ‘impersonal use’ in the title of their study in that it was used as the umbrella term for all usages they discussed.

In terms of typological classification, Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990: 753) state that languages such as Japanese and Korean “do not possess a clearly defined closed set of personal pronouns”, having “no recourse to impersonal use” of the second person pronoun. However, I shall note that in fact, in Japanese, this statement is based on limited environments only. I argue that an analysis of a wider range of discourse in the data of the current study reveals that *anata* is used impersonally in reported speech in Japanese. In what follows, I will demonstrate this. I start by discussing the case which is equivalent to what Biq (1991) calls ‘dramatic use’ of Mandarin *ni*. I then consider the use of *anata* in relation to the point made by Yule (1982: 320) that impersonal pronouns are often used in the context of generalisation of life situations and knowledge.

Before my discussion, I touch on some relevant information about reported speech in Japanese. It has been said that, in Japanese, direct and indirect quotations are
sometimes not clearly distinguished (Coulmas, 1985; Kamada, 2000). Observe the following examples. For (11a), two possible translations are given.

(11) a. Kinoo, Taro o wa boku ni, kyoo wa daremo
    yesterday GN TOP 1PP to today TOP no.one
    boku no uchi e konai daroo to itta.
    1PP LK house DES come-NEG suppose-INF QT said
    ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me that no one would probably come to my (the speaker’s) house today.’
    ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me “Today, no one will probably come to my (Taro’s) house” ’.

b. Kinoo, Taro o wa boku ni, kyoo wa daremo
    yesterday GN TOP 1PP to today TOP no.one
    boku no uchi e konai daroo ne to itta.
    1PP LK house DES come-NEG suppose-INF SFP QT said
    ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me “Today, no one will probably come to my house, will they?” ’.

c. Kinoo, Taro o wa boku ni, kyoo wa daremo
    yesterday GN TOP 1PP to today TOP no.one
    boku no uchi e konai deshoo to itta.
    1PP LK house DES come-NEG suppose-FOR QT said
    ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me “Today, no one will probably come to my house” ’.
    (Kamada, 2000: 158)

Example sentences (11a), (11b) and (11c) are identical except for the ending of the embedded sentences. While example (11a) includes the ‘plain’ form of a modal auxiliary daroo ‘suppose/probably’, (11b) has the sentence final particle ne ‘will they?’ and (11c) uses deshoo, which is the formal form of daroo. Among these three example sentences,
(11a) can be in fact interpreted as both a direct and indirect quotation. As Japanese does not require a tense inflection for an embedded quoted sentence, kyoo ‘today’ can be understood as the day the sentence (11a) is uttered. If this is the case, it is an indirect quotation and boku in boku no uchi ‘my house’ is the speaker of the utterance (that is, not Taro) in (11a). Thus, the meaning of the sentence is translated into English as ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me that no one would probably come to my house today.’ On the other hand, if kyoo ‘today’ is interpreted as the day of the original speaker Taro’s utterance, that is, the day previous to the utterance (11a), boku in boku no uchi is understood as being Taro. Hence the meaning of the sentence in English is ‘Yesterday, Taro said to me “Today, no one will come to my house”’. Because there is no requirement for a tense inflection in an embedded quoted sentence and no changes to word order between a question sentence and a declarative sentence, these features can sometimes make Japanese reported speech ambiguous.

However, the distinction between direct and indirect speech can be identified based on deictic switches (Coulmas, 1985; Kamada, 2000). Kamada (2000: 63ff) points out that a direct quotation is a mechanism for the speaker to bring a ‘new utterance’ from the original speaker into the current communication situation. In this process, there are ways the deixis, especially social deixis in the case of Japanese, plays an important role in indexing the ‘new utterance’. These include interjections, personal reference terms, attitudinal expressions such as honorifics and sentence final particles. Looking at examples (11b) and (11c), there are some elements which cause these sentences to be interpreted as direct quotations.

37 Recall the categories of deixis mentioned in Chapter 2. For readers’ convenience, I restate Levinson’s (2004) classifications: (i) person deixis, (ii) time deixis, (iii) spatial deixis, (iv) discourse deixis, and (v) social deixis.
In (11b), the sentence final particle *ne* is used. In Japanese, sentence final particles are one of the most frequently employed linguistic items in spoken conversation (McGloin, 1990; Ide and Sakurai, 1997; Katagiri, 2007; Lee, 2007; Ogi, 2014). They convey the speaker’s invitation to the hearer to encourage the hearer’s involvement in a variety of ways during the interaction (Lee, 2007; Ogi, 2014). If only looking at the quoted parts in (11a) *kyoo wa daremo boku no uchi ni konai daroo* and in (11b) *kyoo wa daremo boku no uchi ni konai daroo ne*, these two sentences denote the same propositional information, ‘No one will probably come to my house today’. However, these two sentences differ from each other in their interactional aspect. While the former sentence without *ne* may simply describe the propositional information, the latter sentence with *ne* indicates that this sentence is uttered as part of a two-way conversation. The sentence final particle *ne* is used to seek or convey the speaker’s alignment with the hearer in interaction (Ogi, 2014). In adding *ne*, the quoted sentence in (11b) is interpreted as the utterance by the original speaker in the presence of the original addressee. This leads to the deictic shift and the sentence is interpreted as a direct quotation. As for (11c), the quoted sentence ends with the polite form of the modal auxiliary (i.e., *deshoo*). It also indicates an addressee’s presence, in this case an addressee to whom the original speaker had to show respect in the original conversational situation. Thus, the quotation in (11c) is also interpreted as a direct one.

Let us look at the use of personal reference terms which contribute to shifting the deictic perspective of the quoted sentence. Observe the following example from a TV interview.

(12) 1 *Kimi, anoo taihen da na, iroiro to. Koo, are,* 
2PP: *kimi* FL tough BE SFP in.many.ways FL that
In (12), a guest speaker who is an actor is talking about a memory of his middle school teacher. The use of *kimi* in (12) indexes the start of the direct quotation and represents a teacher’s typical reference term towards a student. This *kimi* is not referring to the addressee (i.e., the host of the TV interview show) in the immediate conversational situation but is used in a quotation. The interlocutors’ deictic perspectives are shifted to the teacher-student conversational situation from the speaker’s past.

It should be noted here that a direct quotation does not mean that the quoted sentence is verbatim from the original speaker. Although a direct quotation has traditionally been regarded as faithful to the original speaker’s utterances, whereas an indirect quotation reports its content and conveys the sense but not the exact words (Partee, 1973), more recent studies have noted the creative aspects of reported speech (Tannen, 1989, 2007; Kamada, 2000; Maynard, 1996b). Kamada (2000) notes that even a direct quotation is not necessarily verbatim but a ‘creation’ of the speaker based on the immediate conversational context and the speaker’s attitude.

Returning to the use of *kimi* in example (12) above, the term may not in fact have been used necessarily by the original speaker (i.e., the current speaker’s middle school teacher at that time). Rather, the speaker is trying to create a scene which is embedded in his current speech by using a reference term which is typically used by a teacher.
towards a student. In so doing, the speaker is trying to present this in a drama-like scene for the audience.

The idea that a quotation is a creation of the speaker is in line with Tannen’s (1989, 2007) ‘constructed dialogue’ which offers an insight regarding what is generally called ‘reported speech’.

I am claiming that when a speaker represents an utterance as the words of another, what results is by no means describable as ‘reported speech.’ Rather it is constructed dialogue. And the construction of the dialogue represents an active, creative, transforming move which expresses the relationship not between the quoted party and the topic of talk but rather the quoting party and the audience to whom the quotation is delivered.

(Tannen, 1989: 109)

The list of what Tannen (1989) claims as constructed dialogues includes dialogue as instantiation of general phenomenon, dialogue which includes vague referents, dialogue cast in the persona of a nonhuman speaker and others. While Tannen’s claim captures the nature of what is called ‘quotation’ or ‘reported speech’, I will continue to use the general term ‘reported speech’ for the remainder of the thesis in order to avoid any later confusion during discussion of the case where a speaker reads out a document prepared or ‘constructed’ in advance (cf. Chapter 7).

Given these features of reported speech, let us look at the use of anata in reported speech. Observe the following example (13) from Japanese parliamentary debate. This example is the utterance of a politician when talking about his visit to a debris processing site after the 2011 tsunami disaster in the north-east part of Japan. He was impressed by the inner strength of the people there, because they were working rather talkatively even
after they had lost their families. He relates the following scene involving dialogue at the site.

(13) 1 Ah, anata mo sooiu tsunami o keikenshimashita ka,
     Oh 2PP: anata also that.sort.of tsunami OBJ experienced QUE
2 anata mo desu ka, aa, anata wa obasan o
     2PP: anata also BE QUE oh 2PP: anata TOP aunt OBJ
3 nakushite, watashi wa miuchi o kooiu fuuni nakushite to,
     lost 1PP TOP relatives OBJ like.this lost QT
4 soko de iroirona hanashi ga dekiru n desu ne.
     there LOC various talk OBJ can.do NOM BE SFP
‘ “Oh, did you (anata) also experience that sort of tsunami?”, “You (anata) too?”, “Oh, you (anata) lost your aunt and I lost my family like this”, in that situation, (we) can talk a lot.’

(Accounts committee meeting: 27/08/2012)

In (13), the utterance includes anata three times and each anata refers to different individuals. The conversational parties’ identities and their social elements in the reported speech are unknown and cannot be typically identified. As noted earlier, the use of anata in reported speech does not necessarily mean that the original speaker actually used the term at the scene. In a real situation like this, the quoted parties would most likely use each other’s names. Here, the speaker of (13) is not attempting to ‘report’ the exact conversations among quoted parties, but is creating a typical scene from the tsunami debris site he visited by playing the roles of imaginary individuals at the site. In this creation of the scene, the use of anata serves to present generalised characters. As shown earlier with regard to English and Mandarin, the impersonal use of second person
pronouns has the characteristic of impersonating a story. Such a scene as described in (13) is described as one of the frequently observed scenes at the site.

In example (13) we are able to recognise the similarity between this use of anata and what Biq (1991) called dramatic ni in Mandarin. The explanation Biq (1991: 310-311) gives below could also be used to describe the use of anata in (13).

The dramatic ni occurs as part of the shifting of the entire frame of reference from the discourse situation to the described situation. The speaker now (temporarily) deserts his/her point of view, creating a story impersonation by assuming the role of one of the characters in the described situation and using ni to address another character in the same situation. During such a story impersonation, personal pronouns are ‘relativized’ according to the described situation (character X is ‘I’, character Y is ‘you’, etc.) rather than according to the discourse situation (speaker is ‘I’, addressee is ‘you’, etc.).

(Biq, 1991: 310-311)

As mentioned earlier, Yule (1982: 320) points out that impersonal pronouns are often used in the context of generalisation of life situations or knowledge. This aspect is also observed in the use of anata in reported speech. The following examples illustrate this.

(14) 1 Kyoodaisuu no genshoo, mikonritsu
number.of.siblings LK decrease percentage.of.unmarried.people

2 no jooshoo ni yotte, kazoku no naka de, anata wa
increase due.to family LK inside LOC 2PP: anata TOP

3 hataraite, anata wa kaigo o shite, to iu yoona
work 2PP: anata TOP care OBJ do QT say like

4 yakuwari buntan ga muzukashii, sooshita jookyoo ni
role sharing SBJ difficult such circumstance LOC
5 gozaimasu.
exist-HON
‘Due to the decrease in the number of siblings and increase in the percentage of unmarried people, (we are) in a circumstance where it is difficult to distribute roles in a family, like “You (anata) work” and “You (anata) care for the elderly” ’.

(Financial committee, 03/22/2012)

(15) 1 Keizaijin toshite ningen wa sore nari no homo.economicus as human.being TOP in.its.own.way NOM 2 paasonaritii o motteiru wake desu kara, anata wa personality OBJ have reason BE so 2PP: anata TOP 3 ikura made shika kariraremasen yo to genteisuru no this.much up.to only can.not.borrow SFP QT limit NOM 4 wa kiwamete jinkenshingai janai ka to TOP extremely violation.of.human.rights BE-NEG QUE QT 5 omou gurai chotto hidoi hooritsu dearu to omoimasu.
think almost sort.of terrible law BE QT think ‘As homo economicus, (it is) the case that human beings have a personality of their own, so, limiting like “You (anata) can only borrow this much” is an extremely terrible law, to the extent that (I) think it’s almost a violation of human rights.’

(Financial committee meeting: 15/06/2012)

Both examples are from parliamentary debate. In (14), the speaker is describing a general tendency in an ageing society in Japan, where problems arise due to the combination of the decrease in the number of children and the increase in the percentage of unmarried people. The speaker here is constructing dialogues using anata and acting them out as a general situation. The first anata and the second anata are referring to different individuals and these referents can be replaced by ‘one’ and ‘another’ in
indirect speech, as in *hitori wa hataraitte, moo hitori wa kaigo o shite* ‘one works and another takes care of the elderly’. It is an example of what Tannen (2007: 113) calls a constructed dialogue as “an instantiation of a general phenomenon”.

In example (15), the speaker is criticising a proposed financial law which controls the total amount of debt allowed to individuals. The constructed utterance *anata wa ikura made shika karirarenai yo* is describing a clause in the proposed law which states that an individual can only borrow a certain amount of money from financial institutions. This part can be rephrased by generic expressions such as *hitori ikura made shika karirarenai* ‘(we) can only borrow up to this much per person’.

I have described the use of *anata* in reported speech where the referent of *anata* is not a specific individual but an unspecified someone in constructed settings and thus provided clear evidence for the impersonal use of personal pronouns in Japanese. The reason for the notion that impersonal use of personal pronouns does not exist in Japanese is because Japanese personal pronouns are regarded inevitably as social-indexical, as discussed in Chapter 3. Thus, they are viewed as “too loaded with semantic and pragmatic information […] to be generalized or used impersonally” (Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 756). However, *anata* has a unique property which absolutely specifies the second person without indexing social elements of the interlocutors. It can function primarily as mere person-deixis, just like the English *you*. This provides a straightforward answer to the question of why *anata* shares this aspect of impersonal uses with languages that more clearly possess this function. Kitagawa and Lehrer (1990) explain this phenomenon as follows.

With the impersonal uses of personal pronouns, the role identities of speech act participants are abstracted from their immediate deictic domain and used
nonreferentially to depict universally applicable life events. A discourse effect of this is that speech act participants can be viewed as dramatis personae in the world of generalized and abstract discourse, somewhat like ‘Everyman’ in a medieval morality play.

(Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 752)

It is beneficial at this point to explore the origin of the terms ‘first person’ and ‘second person’. Lyons has explained person-deixis as follows (1977: 638).

The origin of the traditional terms ‘first person’, ‘second person’ and ‘third person’ is illuminating in this connexion. The Latin word ‘persona’ (meaning “mask”) was used to translate the Greek word for “dramatic character” or “role”, and the use of this term by grammarians derives from their metaphorical conception of a language-event as a drama in which the principal role is played by the first person, the role subsidiary to this by the second person, and all other roles by the third person. […] only the speaker and addressee are actually participating in the drama.

(Lyons, 1977: 638)

Although none of the published work has discussed the impersonal use of anata in the field of Japanese linguistics, it is now evident that this use does exist and is attributable to the ability of anata to absolutely specify the second person. Anata’s role is to refer to the second person persona without entailing his/her social elements but simply to designate him/her purely as the second person entity.

5.5. Referring to an unfamiliar addressee

Given that a property of anata is absolute specification of the second person, evidenced in some aspects of linguistic practice in Japanese as shown in previous sections, an
interesting tendency regarding the frequency of the use of *anata* becomes explicable. A particular drama shows up in the study data with a much higher frequency of the occurrence of *anata* than other dramas. The following table demonstrates this.

(16) The frequency of occurrence of *anata* in dramas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of drama</th>
<th>Frequency of occurrence of <em>anata</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Kazoku geemu</em> ‘Family game’</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kiken na aneki</em> ‘My dangerous sister’</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Kaseifu no Mita</em> ‘Housekeeper Mita’</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Riigaru Hai</em> ‘Legal high’</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>401</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To obtain these figures, the number of occurrence of *anata* in ten episodes of each drama was counted. Each episode was broadcast in an hour slot on TV with some commercials inserted. The total number of occurrences of *anata* in all dramas was four hundred and one. Among these four dramas, *Riigaru Hai* ‘Legal high’ shows an overwhelmingly higher frequency of the occurrence of *anata* than other dramas.

This higher frequency is attributed to the genre of the drama. *Riigaru Hai* is a courtroom drama, where a lawyer plays the main protagonist. The drama series includes a number of scenes of various court cases where the main character, his colleagues and his rivals all speak as lawyers. Thus, the series shows abundant characteristics of Japanese linguistic practices in courtrooms.
In courtrooms, *anata* is typically used when a lawyer refers to the accused, a defendant or a witness. The following example illustrates this. (In (17), L = lawyer; W = witness)

(17) 1 L: *Shoonin, onegaishimasu.*
    witness please
    ‘Witness, please.’

2 W: *Kawada Hiroo. Daigaku no kooshi desu.*
    FN GN university LK lecturer BE
    ‘(I’m) Kawada Hiroo, a university lecturer.’

3 L: *Osumai wa dochira desu ka.*
    place.to.live TOP where BE QUE
    ‘Where do (you) live?’

4 W: *Minato ku no manshon shitti-hiruzu-akasaka desu.*
    Minato district LK apartment City-Hills-Akasaka BE
    ‘(It’s) an apartment City Hills Akasaka in Minato ward.’

5 L: *Oya, hikokunin to onaji manshon desu ne.*
    oh accused LK same apartment BE SFP
    ‘Oh, (it’s) the same apartment as the accused, isn’t it?’

6 W: *Hai.*
    yes
    ‘Yes.’

7 L: *Gojitaku ni minarenai mono ga attara mottekite hoshii*  
    home LOC unfamiliar thing SBJ exist-CD bring want

8 to *onegaishita no desu ga, mottekite kudasaimashita ka.*
QT asked NOM BE but kindly.brought-HON QUE
‘(I’ve) asked (you) to bring anything which was found at home but unfamiliar to (you). Did (you) kindly bring it?’

9 W: Aa, hai, ee, kore desu.
   ah yes FL this BE
   ‘Ah, yes, well, (it’s) this.’

10 L: Sore wa nan deshoo.
   that TOP what suppose
   ‘What (do you think) is that?’

11 W: Wakarimasen. Hondana no naka ni arimashita ga
   do.not.know book.shelf LK inside LOC existed but

12 mioboe ga nai.
   recognition SUB absent
   ‘I don’t know. (It) was in a bookshelf but I don’t recognise (it).’

13 L: Anata no shiranai uchini mochikomareta mono dearu
   2PP: anata SBJ do.not.know during brought-PASS thing BE to?
   QT
   ‘Does it mean that this is something which was brought in without you (anata) knowing?’

14 W: Soo to shika omoemasen.
   so QT only cannot.think
   ‘(I) cannot think other than so.’
   (Riigaru Hai, 1)
In example (17), W is a witness who is called to testify. He introduces himself stating his name and his occupation as a university lecturer. In a normal conversational situation, once someone introduces his/her name or occupation, the conversational partner would then use the name or the appropriate occupational term. If one introduces him/herself as a university lecturer, the conversation partner would typically use sensei ‘teacher/professor’ as a term of respect, even though he/she is not the speaker’s actual teacher.

However, as shown in line 13 in the above example (17), it is often the case in a courtroom that lawyers maintain the use of anata even after the identity and position of the accused or witness is revealed. One way of viewing this phenomenon would be based on the notion that anata is a formal second person pronoun and hence used in official settings. Another way would be to argue that lawyers and prosecutors are higher in social status or possess more knowledge than the accused or the witnesses and hence they can use anata as an accepted term to refer to an inferior. However, as I discussed in Chapter 2, both these views have difficulties accounting for counter examples, which cannot be explained from their perspectives.

I argue that the frequent use of anata in a courtroom is systematically explicable based on the notion of absolute specification of the second person. Lawyers, by using anata, are able to specify the addressee as a ‘mere’ second person without indexing any social elements, whether the addressee claims him/herself a university lecturer or is accused of being a serial killer. Put differently, all individuals in a court are placed equally before judges regardless of their claimed social status. The use of anata expresses a lawyer’s attitude of detachment in treating all addressees as mere individuals. It can also demonstrate a sense of fairness. It would be difficult or even inappropriate
for lawyers to address a particular addressee using a socially indexical reference term because this would create certain effects, for example indicating that the lawyer and the addressee had a certain social relationship. It is more appropriate for the lawyer to treat the addressee as someone who has no relationship at all to him/her.

Interestingly, the main character of this drama Komikado, a lawyer, sometimes uses different terms to refer to the same person inside and outside the court. Let us look at example (18) below, which is an utterance of the lawyer Komikado to the accused Ando inside the court. In this utterance, he uses anata to show that there is no social relationship between them. (In (18), K = Komikado; A = Ando)

(18) K: Anata ga koonyuushita to iu n desu ka.
   2PP: anata SUB purchased QT say NOM BE QUE
   ‘Do (you) say that you (anata) purchased (it)?’

   A: Hai.
   yes
   ‘Yes.’

   K: Anata jishin ga, anata no ishi de.
   2PP: anata self SUB 2PP: anata LK will by
   ‘You (anata) yourself, by your (anata) own will.’

   (Liigaru Hai, 1)

Komikado is asking Ando if she purchased the drug under discussion by herself. He overtly refers to Ando as anata. By using anata, the social relationship between the lawyer Komikado and the accused Ando is kept undefinable. The overt use of anata displays unrelatedness between them and it assists to maintain the speaker’s business-
like, detached and ‘fair’ attitude towards the addressee. This is appropriate in the court context.

However, Komikado uses a different second person reference term when he meets Ando in a meeting room outside the court. Example (19) below is his utterance using Ando san ‘Ms. Ando’. Preceding this extract, Ando expressed her intention to give up the case and hence have no need to hire Komikado thereafter. However, Komikado wants to continue the case until victory due to his pride and the money she had offered upon winning. Komikado’s pathetic attitude in begging Ando for her reconsideration is depicted somewhat comically here.

(19) 1 Andoo sa~n, moo ichido hanashiaimasen ka~.
   FN Ms. more once do.not.discuss QUE

2 Saiban yattekurenai to watashi no kuroboshi ga
   trial do.not.do.for.me CD 1PP LK failure SUB

3 torimodosenai n desu yo~ Andoo sa~n!
   cannot.regain NOM BE SFP FN Ms.
   ‘Ms. Ando~ , why don’t (we) discuss (this) one more time~? If (you) don’t do
   the trial (for me), (I) cannot make up for my failure, I’m telling (you), Ms.
   Ando~!’

   (Riigaru Hai, 1)

In example (19), the lawyer Komikado uses Ando san ‘Ms. Ando’. By using the accused’s name, Komikado is showing familiarity with her. He uses a socially normative term between adult acquaintances, that is, the family name with the suffix san. This expresses his desire that they treat each other as socially connected. It delivers the message that ‘we know each other’, and by that, Komikado is trying to break down the purely detached stance and make room for further discussion with Ando. In other words,
his shift to the use of Ando’s name is a strategy to gain her sympathy and cooperation. It is in stark contrast to his use of anata inside the court. The former expresses relatedness and the latter expresses unrelatedness between them.

It is noteworthy that in a court, anata is also frequently found in a prosecutor’s narratives when describing the crimes of the accused. Observe the following example.

(20)  
1 Anata wa Tokunaga Ichiroo shi to koosai, soogaku  
2 ichioku en no kinpin o mitsugasete. 
3 Itsushika anata wa Tokunaga shi to no kekkon  
4 o yumemiru yooni natta. Shikashi Tokunaga shi wa  
5 kore o kyohishi, ippootekini koosai o owaraseta.  
6 Anata wa sono koto ni ikari, zetsubooshi, fukushuu o  
7 keikaku, Tsuchiya Norihide yori dokubutsu o nyyuushu.  
8 Nisen juuichi nen rokugatsu sanjuu nichi, anata wa  
9 Tokunaga ke no katteguchi yori shinnyuushi, nabe ni  
10 yooishiteatta suupu ni dokubutsu o konnyuu. 

‘You (anata) were dating Mr. Tokunaga Ichiro, and made (him) supply the total amount of one hundred million yen in money or in kind. Gradually, you (anata) reached the point of dreaming about a marriage with Mr. Tokunaga. However, Mr. Tokunaga rejected this and ended the relationship unilaterally.'
You (anata) were angry at this, despaired, and planned revenge (against him), then obtained poison from Tsuchiya Norihide. In 2011, June 30th, you (anata) trespassed on Tokugawa’s home through the kitchen door and mixed the poison in soup prepared in a pot.’

(Riigaru Hai, 1)

The above extract is the prosecutor’s description of Ando’s alleged crime scene. The prosecutor is using anata to refer to Ando as the addressee because he is ostensibly talking to her. However, his lines are narrative in style and his linguistic devices do not express an interactional attitude. For example, he does not use devices for seeking agreement or confirmation by employing question forms, such as yumemiru yooninatta? ‘Did you come to dream?’, or sentence final particles, such as yumemiru yooninatta ne ‘You came to dream it, didn’t you?’. Here, anata is used with an impersonal tone, as if it refers to a ‘dramatis personae’ (Kitagawa and Lehrer, 1990: 752) in the scene, rather than showing an interactional attitude to the addressee in the immediate situation. Owing to the ‘absolute specification’ property which does not specify any social relationship between interlocutors, the use of anata here serves to create a scene-setting effect as if an impersonalised actor was playing a role in the scene. This again maintains the prosecutor’s attitude of detachment regarding the addressee, treating her merely as an addressed character.

We have seen the use of anata to refer to an unfamiliar addressee. The above discussion naturally gives us the idea that the use of anata may be less restricted when the interlocutors are strangers because in this case, it is difficult for the conversational participants to refer to each other with a specific socially expected reference term.
In the data set of the current study, it was not possible to capture spontaneous conversation between strangers. Instead, I discuss some phenomena that have been described in previous studies as well as comments from the respondents of the survey in this study regarding this use of *anata*.

Saito (1999: 4) captured a scene she watched in a TV program as follows.

Saikin mita terebi nyuuusu no intabyuu no naka dewa, shitsumonsuru hito ga, “*anata* wa doo omoimasu ka?” o mattaku no ipponjooshi de, marude kanjoo ga nai robotto sokkurina kikaitekiina pitchi no takai koe de samazamana soo no hitobito ni booyomi no kakikotoba choo de yatsugibaya ni kiiteita mono ga atta.

‘In the TV news I watched recently, there was a scene where the interviewer asked around to various people “What do you (*anata*) think?” in a completely monotonous tone like an emotionless robot would do with a mechanical and high pitched voice. The question was fired to one after another rapidly like a written question that was read out in a monotone.’

(Saito, 1999: 4)

The interviewer’s use of *anata* here is explicable given the absolute specification of the second person property of *anata*. The audience knew that the interviewer did not know the interviewees and did not have time to ask their names because of the necessity of collecting as many answers as possible, therefore his/her use of *anata* was tolerated terminology for referring to unfamiliar individuals in a mechanical way.

In the survey discussed in Chapter 4, there are comments from the respondents that express the possibility of the use of *anata* between unfamiliar individuals. Consider the following representative comments.

*Mijika na hito kara iwareru to, teikoo o kanjimasu ga, mishiranu hito kara iwareru bun niwa, teikoo o kanjimasen.*
‘If I were referred to (as anata) by someone close, I would feel offended but if it’s from an unfamiliar person, I wouldn’t.’ (Respondent 51)

Tsuujoo shiyoo shinai ga, otoshimono nado o mitsuketa toki, ‘kore anata no dewa arimasen ka’ nado to iu yoo ni shiyoo suru.

‘Usually I don’t use (anata) but if I found someone dropped something, I would say something like “Isn’t this yours (anata no)?” ’

(Respondent 424)

These comments suggest that when the interlocutors do not know each other, the use of anata seems to be an acceptable option. Put differently, the simple specification of second person is understandable when the conversation participants’ social relationship is not identifiable.38

5.6. Summary

In this chapter, I have analysed the use of anata in a context where the interlocutors’ relationship is undefinable. This context was further divided into three cases.

First, I have described the case where anata is used to address a general audience. Since the use of anata does not specify the addressee’s social elements, it is suitable when used to refer to a broad range of people in certain cases, such as in some advertisements.

Second, I have demonstrated the impersonal use of anata in reported speech. With its inherent property, absolute specification of a second person entity, anata can primarily serve as a mere person-deixis. This makes it possible for the speaker to abstract

---

38 That said, if there is an apparent age difference, even only visually, a younger speaker would avoid the use of anata towards an older addressee. Superiority and inferiority in terms of age can be visually indexed and it can influence the use of anata.
the second person entity and take it from the immediate discourse domain to that of a
generalised story as a form of reported speech in Japanese. Anata can be used as a non-
specific or generalised address term in the described situation. The evidence of the
impersonal use of anata refuted the notion, in the previous studies of Japanese linguistics,
that impersonal use of second person pronouns does not exist in Japanese.

Third, absolute specification of the second person explains cases where the use of
anata occurs in order to refer to an unfamiliar addressee. I have shown this using a
courtroom context in which a lawyer refers to the accused and to witnesses as anata, in
order to treat them as mere individuals standing equally before the judges. I observed
that anata can also be used in a second person narrative style as if an impersonal persona
is acting a described scene. This led to an analysis of the phenomenon whereby the use
of anata is less restricted when the interlocutors are strangers. When the interlocutors
do not know each other, the mere specification of the addressee is more acceptable or in
fact unavoidable in some cases.

In Chapter 3, I described the fundamental system of person reference in Japanese.
Recall that Suzuki (1973: 198) describes this in the following way: “the Japanese ego
may be construed as being in an indefinite state, with its position undetermined, until a
specific addressee, a concrete person, appears and is identified by the speaker” (English
translation in (Suzuki, 1978: 143)). What has been demonstrated in this chapter are
contexts where the interlocutors’ relationship cannot be typically defined. The use of
anata tends to occur more frequently in these contexts and this is precisely because anata
has the property of absolute specification of the second person.
Chapter 6

Absolute specification
in a socially definable relationship

6.1. Introduction

This chapter will explore the use of *anata* in the second category of the relationship classification, that is, a socially definable relationship. Regarding social relationships, Enfield (2013: 7) states that:

> The social statuses that constitute relationships are defined by sets of rights and duties. These rights and duties are not typically codified in law. They are mostly flexible, tacit, normative, and emergent. They are regimented not by natural laws but by the accountability that is entailed by social norms.

(Enfield, 2013: 7).

The importance of social norms has already been discussed in Chapter 3. We have seen that the system of personal reference in Japanese is a linguistic resource governed by Japanese social norms of communication, which require constant acknowledgement of the relative social status between interlocutors.

In this chapter, it is particularly important to keep these norms in mind. This is because my analysis focuses on the intersection between the use of *anata* and the norms of the Japanese personal reference system. As shown previously, native speakers’ perceptual data (cf. Chapter 4) demonstrates avoidance of *anata* as a default reference
term, regardless of the interlocutors’ social relationship. This tendency is also evidenced in the infrequent use of the term in the corpus of daily conversations (cf. Chapter 1). These facts indicate that *anata* is an outcast among the set of default personal reference terms in everyday conversations. Its use is often a departure from the norm, entailing the addressee’s *iwakan* ‘sense of wrongness/unsuitability’.

Following on from the above, this chapter will show how, as a departure from the norm, *anata* functions in socially definable relationships, creating different effects in different contexts. The chapter is organised in the following order. Section 6.2 explores the use of *anata* in rejecting a given relationship. Section 6.3 examines how *anata* serves to create a special moment in a conversation. Section 6.4 discusses the use of *anata* in attempting to reach an addressee’s core self. It will be demonstrated that the concept of absolute specification of the second person is capable of systematically accounting for these functions.

**6.2. The use of *anata* to reject a given social relationship**

As we have seen, the default background of personal reference is an important part of normative linguistic practice in Japanese society. It displays a key cultural value of social relationship acknowledgement. For insiders, this automatic practice gives the “appearance of ordinariness” (Enfield, 2007a: 97) and hence the default formats are inconspicuous/not noticeable. In this sense, members of Japanese culture work to “render invisible their most heartfelt concerns” (ibid). Enfield (2013: 182) insightfully points out that it is this invisibility of default formats which makes deviation visible.
It is against the background of this default that we may recognize the departures, and only then actively apply our rational interpretation: “Why that now?” Further, in order to calculate what’s being done, it’s not just a matter of “Why that?” but also of “Why not the usual?”.

(Enfield, 2013: 182) 39

Enfield’s statement pinpoints the focus of this chapter. As we have seen, the norm of person reference in Japanese requires an acknowledgement of a specific social relationship between interlocutors, such as kin relations, friendships, employer-employee relations, and teacher-student relations. Thus, if anata is used, which does not display these specific social relationships, it prompts a reaction from the hearer of ‘Why that now?’ and ‘Why not the usual?’ In fact, a speaker’s choice not to acknowledge a social relationship may be motivated by the speaker’s attitude of rejection of that relationship. In this section, we will look at cases of this function of anata.

The case of a contractual relationship

The first case shows the use of anata between interlocutors who are in a certain contractual relationship. For my examples, I have categorised the relationship between a home tutor and a student, and the relationship between a housekeeper and the head of a family into this case. The first example is from a drama, Kazoku Geemu ‘Family Game’. In this drama, a young man comes to a family as a home tutor. While most members of the family simply trust the tutor’s identity and innocently welcome him, the first son Shin’ichi intuitively distrusts him. Although other members refer to the tutor as sensei

---

‘teacher’, following the social norm, Shin’ichi avoids using the term. At some stage, Shin’ichi comes across a rumor that the tutor possibly has a criminal record, and that his name, ‘Koya Yoshimoto’, may not even be his real name.

The following example (1) is from a scene where Shin’ichi reveals the grounds for his suspicion. He shows a photo to the tutor and to his younger brother Shigeyuki when the three of them are at home. The photo is from a yearbook of the University of Tokyo, from where the tutor is believed to have graduated. There is indeed a graduate called Koya Yoshimoto in the album, but the photo shows the face of a completely different person. This photo is one of the pieces of evidence which indicate that the tutor is pretending to be someone else. (In (1), Sn = Shin’ichi; Sg = Shigeyuki)

(1) Sn: Tashikani sotsugyoosei no naka ni Yoshimoto Kooya to iu
Indeed graduates among graduates LOC GN QT say
name name SUB existed it SUB this photo BE
‘Indeed, among graduates, there was a person called Koya Yoshimoto. It’s this photo.’

Sg: …Chigau…
‘…(It’s) different…..’

Sn: …Anata wa….. ittai dare nan desu ka.
2PP: anata TOP on.earth who NOM BE QUE
‘…Who on earth are you (anata)?’

(Kazoku Geemu, 2)
In this example, anata, rather than sensei, is used when asking for the addressee’s true identity. Shin’ichi ‘knows’ the tutor as his home tutor. However, by referring to the tutor as anata, Shin’ichi’s non-acceptance or rejection of the student-teacher relationship between them is explicitly expressed. In fact, among alternative reference terms, anata best illustrates his stance. Compare the following examples. (1a)’ is a restatement of Shin’ichi’s utterance from (1). In (1b)’ and (1c)’, anata is replaced by other second person reference terms.

(1)’

a. Anata wa ittai dare nan desu ka.

2PP: anata TOP on.earth who NOM BE QUE
‘Who on earth are you (anata)?’

b. Sensei wa ittai dare nan desu ka.

2P: sensei TOP on.earth who NOM BE QUE
‘Who on earth are you (sensei ‘teacher’)?’

c. Yoshimoto san wa ittai dare nan desu ka.

FN Mr. TOP on.earth who NOM BE QUE
‘Who on earth are you (Mr. Yoshimoto)?’

Example (1b)’ is odd because Shin’ichi regards the tutor as a suspect character and hence is reluctant to accept him. The use of sensei ‘teacher’ would display Shin’ichi’s acceptance of this man as his teacher, which contradicts what he wants to express. In (1c)’, referring to the tutor as Yoshimoto is also odd because the very name is the cause for suspicion about the man’s identity. In the above situation, Shin’ichi is trying to show that the tutor who calls himself Yoshimoto is not in fact Yoshimoto. Thus, (1c)’ does not make logical sense. It appears that absolute specification of the addressee with the
use of *anata* is the best possible reference for the tutor, in delivering the message ‘I do not accept you as my teacher’.

The next example (2) is from a drama called *Kaseifu no Mita* ‘Housekeeper Mita’. The conversation is between a housekeeper and the head of a family. Normally, the housekeeper, Mita, refers to Keiichi as *goshujin sama* ‘(lit.) Master’. Keiichi refers to Mita as *Mita san* ‘Ms Mita’, which is a normal way for adults to refer to someone they know but are not very close to. The use of last name + *san* is common in adults’ relationships such as between colleagues and acquaintances as well as when a superior speaker refers respectfully to an inferior addressee. Throughout the drama, these terms are their default reference terms. However, when Keiichi gets angry with Mita, he momentarily uses *anata* as follows. (In (2), K = Keiichi; M = Mita)

(2) 1 K: *Chotto, nan nan desu ka, anata!*
    hey what NOM BE QUE 2PP: anata
    ‘Hey! What the hell are you (*anata*)?’

2 M: ................
    ‘................’

3 K: *Nani ga attemo hyoojoo hitotsu kaenai*
    What SUB happen.even facial.expression one do.not.change
    shi, meireisaretara donna mechakuchana koto demo

4 and order-PASS-CD however crazy thing even
    heikide yatte. *Anata* ni wa kokoro tte mono ga

5 indifferently do 2PP: *anata* LOC TOP heart QT thing SUB
    nai n desu ka.
    absent NOM BE QUE
‘Whatever happens, (you) don’t even change one bit of facial expression, and if ordered, (you) do anything however crazy it is. In you (anata), is there no such thing as ‘heart’?’

(Kaseifu no Mita, 3)

Mita has a traumatic past, which has left her unable to show her emotions. She is always business-like and quiet, although she works perfectly and professionally. Preceding the extract (2), Keiichi was talking about personal stories, such as his married life and fatherhood. Mita did not engage in conversation with him, but replied to him with ‘My office hours have finished, so please excuse me’, after which she tried to go home, prompting Keiichi’s angry outburst. At this moment, Keiichi’s main concern is not the acknowledgement of a given social relationship with his housekeeper. By using anata, which absolutely specifies the addressee, he expresses his emotion and momentarily ignores their social relationship.

This is a good example of how an individual’s stance and attitude can be affected by a spontaneous emotional explosion and influence his/her use of personal reference terms. The use of anata is often observed when the speaker attacks or argues with an addressee. In these moments, the speaker tends to ignore the existence of any social relationship with the addressee. Although Keiichi’s use of anata in the above example (2) did not ultimately cause a fight or quarrel because Mita did not challenge him, it is possible that the use of anata could trigger verbal conflict or argument between interlocutors.
The case of a kin relationship

The rejection of a given social relationship with the use of *anata* can also be observed in kin relations. The next example is from the drama *Kiken na aneki* ‘My dangerous older sister’, which features a sibling relationship. The extracted conversations are between a younger brother and an older sister. As a social norm, the younger brother Yutaro is supposed to address his older sister Hiroko with one of a variety of kin terms, such as *oneesan, neesan, oneechan, neechan, and aneki*, all of which mean ‘older sister’.

At the start of the drama, Yutaro uses a kin term *aneki* ‘older sis’ towards Hiroko, showing that this term has been his default term for Hiroko. However, as the story develops, Yutaro starts avoiding this term and instead uses *anata* more and more frequently, as in example (3) below. (In (3), Y = Yutaro; H = Hiroko)

(3) Y: *Kotchi wa ne, ima daijina jiki nan da yo.*
   ‘This is an important time for me, (I)’m telling (you). (I) don’t have time to care about you (*anata*).’

   H: *Daijina jiki tte?*
   ‘(What do you mean by) important time?’

   Y: *Taihenna kanja o tantooshiteru.*
   ‘(I)’m in charge of a tough patient.’

(Kikenna Aneki, 2)
Yutaro is a medical doctor at a big hospital in Tokyo and currently in charge of a difficult patient whose life is threatened. The patient is an old man who does not follow the doctor’s instructions. The situation is challenging for Yutaro, not only in terms of dealing with the patient’s life-threatening disease, but also negotiating the patient’s mindset. Yutaro has been stressed by the situation, but Hiroko is ignorant of this, talking cheerfully to him about unrelated things. When Yutaro becomes annoyed by this, he makes the utterance in (3), using anata.

By using anata instead of aneki ‘older sis’, Yutaro avoids acknowledging their brother-sister relationship temporarily and hence takes the stance of rejecting it. In the extract (3) above, the topic marker nanka is used with anata. Nanka is used by a speaker to express the noun marked by nanka as something contemptible, dissatisfactory, or derogatory (Maynard, 2001a). By saying anata nanka in this extract, Yutaro delivers messages such as ‘I don’t want to accept our sibling relationship’ and ‘I don’t even respect you’.

Although Yutaro’s utterance in (3) above was momentary, his use of anata gradually becomes more frequent as the drama portrays his constant struggle regarding Hiroko as his sister. As the story unfolds, their background is gradually revealed. The siblings grew up in a small country town in Southern Japan, where their father was running a small factory to make a traditional alcoholic spirit. The drama depicts the contrast between Hiroko and Yutaro when they were younger. Hiroko innocently enjoyed life in the small country town. However, Yutaro could not stand the complacent country life, longing to leave the town. He studied extremely hard and passed an entrance exam to get into medical school at a university in Tokyo. There, he continued to study hard and became a medical doctor. On the other hand, Hiroko gave up studying after her
graduation from high school and helped out at their father’s factory. Yutaro did not understand why his sister was so easily satisfied in life, seeing her as lacking ambition and a desire to achieve.

After their father passed away, Hiroko moved to Tokyo, and insisted on living with Yutaro. Yutaro resisted, but temporarily let her stay at his place. Hiroko decided to live in Tokyo and looked for a job. However, as she was not well educated and did not have a good employment history, it was difficult for her to find a decent job. In the end, Hiroko decided to work at a *kyabakura*, a cabaret where female hosts flirt with and serve alcoholic drinks to male guests. When Yutaro found out about her job, he was completely disgusted. The following example is the scene of their confrontation. This extract displays Yutaro’s honest feelings and stance towards his sister. (In (4), Y = Yutaro; H = Hiroko)

(4) 1 Y: *Deteke!* *Ima sugu deteke!* *Iyadatta n da yona.*
get.out now immediately get.out hated NOM BE SFP

2 *Nanka iyadatta n da yo, mukashi kara.*
somewhat hated NOM BE SFP long.time.ago from

3 *Dooshite anata wa jibun o otoshimerareru n*
why 2PP: anata TOP self OBJ can.disgrace NOM

4 *desu ka. Dooshitara sonnani iikagenni ikirareru?*
BE QUE how so irresponsibly can.live

5 *Doko made ikihaji o sarasu n dayo. Kao dake dakara*
how.far living.shame OBJ expose NOM SFP Face only so

6 *nandemo ari ka.*
anything.is.fine QUE

‘Get out! Right now, get out! (I’ve) hated (you). I’ve somehow hated (you), since a long time ago. Why can you (anata) disgrace yourself? How can (you) live so irresponsibly? How far will (you) expose (yourself) to living
shamefully? (All you have is) the (pretty) face, so anything is fine (= you don’t have pride), is that so?’

7 H: Sorrya, watashi wa koosotsu da shi, mukashi well 1PP TOP high.school.graduate BE and long.time.ago

8 kara Yuutaro mitaini benkyoo wa dekinai kedo… from GN like study TOP cannot but

‘Well, I’m only a high school graduate and since a long time ago I’ve never been capable academically like Yutaro (you), but…’

9 Y: Dekinai wake janai. Yaranakatta dake daro? cannot.do not.necessarily did.not.do only suppose

10 Kanchigaisunna yo! Boku wa anata ya oyaji not.misunderstand-IMP SFP 1PP TOP 2PP: anata and dad

11 mitaini nan no ga iya de, inaka ga iya de hisshini like become NOM OBJ hate country OBJ hate desperately

12 doryokushita kara ima ga aru n da yo! made.effort so now SUB exist NOM BE SFP

13 Sore o anata to watashi wa chigau kara that OBJ 2PP: anata and 1PP TOP different because

14 tte sonna an’ina kotoba de katazukeruna yo! QT such easy word by not.settle-IMP SFP

15 Anata mitaina aneki o motsu boku no kimochi ga 2PP: anata like older.sister OBJ have 1PP LK feeling SUB

16 wakarimasu ka? understand QUE

‘(It’s) not necessarily “not capable”. (You) just didn’t try, right? Don’t misunderstand! I hated being like you (anata) and dad, (I) hated the country life, and so I worked extremely hard. That’s why I have this current life. For that fact, (you said) “you and I are different”, don’t put it in such simple words! Do (you) understand my feeling of having an older sister like you (anata)?’

(Kikenna Aneki, 1)
This scene clearly shows Yutaro’s disdain towards his sister. Here, Yutaro’s repetitive use of *anata* in lines 3, 10 and 15 shows a strong resistance to referring to Hiroko as ‘sister’. The uses of *anata* in line 3 and 15 co-occur with polite style *desu ka* and *masu ka* with which Yutaro expresses his attitude of distancing his sister.

Yutaro’s rejection of her is influenced by some of his beliefs. The drama portrays Yutaro’s values as being shaped by a number of dichotomies, such as urban life vs. rural life, hardworking vs. laid back, educated vs. non-educated, and white collar vs. blue collar, based on which he forms a winner vs. loser dyad. From Yutaro’s perspective, Hiroko represents all of the ‘loser’ categories he hates. His utterance in line 15 *anata mitaina aneki o motsu boku no kimochi ga wakarimasu ka* ‘Do (you) understand my feeling of having an older sister like you (*anata*)?’ clearly expresses his rejection of his sister.

In their psycholinguistic research, Yokotani and Hasegawa (2010a) point out that there are uses of ‘unbound’ sets of personal reference terms in a family relationship. An unbound set is in contrast to a ‘bound’ set, which is a stable combination of reciprocal terms: for example, in a bound set, a father is addressed with a kinship term such as *otoosan* ‘father’ or *papa* ‘daddy’ by his children, and he addresses them with their names. If there is instability present in the bound set, then it is an unbound set. Yokotani and Hasegawa’s study (2010a) reveals that there is a certain level of correlation between the use of an unbound set of personal reference terms and family dysfunction. Yutaro’s use of *anata* continues until the end of the drama, when he finally accepts Hiroko as his sister. The drama captures the dysfunctional relationship between the siblings in part through Yutaro’s use of *anata*. 
The ‘dysfunction’ may be expressed through the use of different address terms at certain life stages. Spehri Badi (2013) studies the use of address terms in Persian and Japanese. She reports that in both languages, as one grows, the speaker’s life stage affects their use of address terms. Spehri Badi’s study was based on a self-reported survey and did not include discourse analysis based on actual conversations, thus, example sentences were not shown. By chance, however, I witnessed an episode of life stage influence on the choice of personal reference terms in my own interactions when, during my stay in Japan, I had an interesting conversation with my nephew.

The context of the following conversation was that I was staying at my parents’ house in Japan during the New Year’s holidays. I saw one of my nephews, a teenager. He came, unaccompanied by his parents, by bullet train from Tokyo all the way to the west side of Japan, which shows his emerging independence as a teenager. Until that winter, he had called me Yooko obachan ‘Auntie Yoko’. Now, turning fifteen, I found that he did not call me auntie but Yoko san ‘Ms Yoko’. I asked him why and had the following conversation. (In (5), Y = Yoko (the author); N = nephew)

(5) 1 Y: Nanka moo Yooko obachan tte iwanai n FL anymore GN auntie QT do.not.say NOM 2 da ne. Yappari obachan to iu niwa wakasugiru BE SFP sure.enough auntie QT say TOP too.young 3 to kizuita ne. (laugh) QT realised SFP ‘Well, (you) don’t call me Auntie Yoko anymore, do (you)? Surely, (you) realised (I’m too young) for (you) to call auntie? (laugh)’ 4 N: Iya soo janakute. (laugh) No that BE-NEG
‘No, not that (laugh).’

5 Y: Mama no koto wa doo yobu no sa.
mother LK thing TOP how call NOM SFP
‘How do (you) call (your) mum?’

6 N: Rika san da ne.
Rika Miss/Mrs/Ms BE SFP
‘Rika san (Ms. Rika).’

7 Y: Maji de? (laugh)
serious
‘Serious? (laugh)’

8 Ja, papa wa?
then dad TOP
‘(How about) (your) dad, then?’

8 N: Aa, ano hito? Ano hito wa nee....., anata (laugh).
ah that person that person TOP SFP 2PP: anata
‘Ah, that person? That person is....anata (laughter).’

9 Y: (laugh)

As his parents were not with him, I did not witness any actual conversation between them during that holiday. However, what is important here is that my nephew expressed his stance towards his father by saying that he would use anata towards his father. My nephew regards the term as not acknowledging their father-son relationship. In fact, some young respondents in the survey discussed in Chapter 4 shared this stance, making comments about the use of anata towards their parents as follows:
Oya ni tsukau toki mo arimasu ne. “Anata niwa kankei naishi” tte kanji desu ne.
Sometimes (I) use (anata) to my parents. (When I say like) “It’s nothing to do with you (anata)”

(Respondent 38).

This type of comment expresses a teenagers’ rebellious stance towards their parents, explicitly marking non-acknowledgement of their parent-child relationship, and therefore the rejection of it.

Regarding the fluidity of relationships, Enfield (2013: 6) states;

A constantly demanding feature of social life is the management of changes of status. These changes may occur at very fine time scales, such as when we change back and forth from moment to moment between the status of speaker versus addressee in a conversation, or the one who has the next turn in a chess game. Or it may be at longer time scales, less frequent in the life span and typically with greater ceremony as when we change status from single to married, or from uninitiated to initiated.

(Enfield, 2013: 6).

What we have seen thus far has not been about the change in visible social relationships. For example, Yutaro is technically the younger brother of Hiroko for his entire life: this blood relationship cannot be changed. My nephew and his father are forever a son and a father. What these speakers are expressing is a change in their psychological or emotional stance, which can be viewed as a certain state of the ‘relationship’ vis-à-vis the addressee. The use of anata here reflects the speaker’s attitude towards the addressee, which is formed by invisible ‘relationship’ changes. Its use conflicts with the norms of the personal reference system because the interlocutors’ ‘social’ relationship continues
to be maintained in a socially visible way, demanding that the speaker use socially acceptable terms.

The next examples (6) and (7) also show aspects of the speaker’s emotional state with the use of a socially expected kin term in (6) and the use of anata in (7). These examples are also from the drama *Kaseifu no Mita* ‘The Housekeeper Mita’ and both conversations are between the householder Keiichi and his sister-in-law Urara. I categorised the in-law relationship into kin relations because the default use of personal reference terms in in-law relationships is in line with blood-based kin relationships as a social norm. In example (6) below, Urara is asking if Keiichi wants milk in his coffee. (In (6), U = Urara; K = Keiichi)

(6)  

U: **Oniisan,** miruku wa?  
2P: oniisan (older.brother) milk TOP  
‘Would older brother (= you) like milk?’

K: Ore wa daijoobu.  
1PP TOP fine  
‘I’m fine.’  

(*Kaseifu no Mita, 6*)

In-law relationships normally requires politer variations. For example, a son-in-law would refer to a father-in-law as *otoosan* ‘father’, and a younger sister-in-law would refer to an older brother-in-law as *oniisan* ‘older brother’. Informal variations such as *papa, otoochan* ‘dad’, *mama, okaachan* ‘mum’, *oniichan* ‘older brother’ and *oneechan* ‘older sister’ would not normally be used to refer to in-law family members. In this drama, Urara typically uses the polite variation, referring to Keiichi as *oniisan* ‘older
brother’ as in example (6) above. This is utterly normal, and the above conversation is simply an everyday interaction for them.

However, as the story develops, Urara’s use of oniisan starts playing a different role for her. To briefly explain the background, this drama is about a family of five: a father, Keiichi, and his four children. Keiichi’s wife, the children’s mother, has passed away. Since her death, the family has had many difficulties in daily life, and that was the reason Keiichi decided to hire a housekeeper Mita for the household chores and to help with the care of his children. Urara has also been involved with the family and tried to help them since her sister’s death. While becoming involved in their lives, Urara gradually realises that she loves Keiichi romantically, not as her brother-in-law. However, Urara keeps using the term oniisan ‘older brother’ almost until the end of the series. In fact, her use of this default term serves to hide her true feelings.

Urara’s persistent use of oniisan can be seen as being driven by a combination of background factors. Her realisation that she loves her own deceased sister’s husband is a complex issue for her. Culturally, different societies may have different attitudes towards the relationship between a widower and his deceased wife’s sister. In modern Japanese society, there is no law or explicit taboo regarding this matter, so it is neither obligatory nor forbidden, but marrying one’s deceased sibling’s widower is not common.

---

40 Sapir (1916: 327-328) defined the ‘levirate’ and ‘sororate’ as in “the levirate [is] the custom by which a man has the privilege or, more often, duty of marrying the widow of his deceased brother and of bringing up the offspring of their union in his own household. Correlative to this is the custom by which a man has the privilege or duty of marrying the as yet unmarried sister of his deceased wife”. It is reported that “[s]ororate marriage is relatively common in African tribal societies” (Dictionary of Social Sciences, Oxford University Press, 2002). On the other hand, there are examples where such relationships are regarded as not appropriate. For example, in England, marriage to a deceased wife’s sister was once voidable in the English ecclesiastical courts but was regarded as problematic, then later became illegal in Lord Lyndhurst’s Act in 1835 (Frew, 2012: 265). It was not until The Deceased Wife’s Sister’s Marriage Act of 1907 that a man was allowed to marry his dead wife’s sister.
In Urara’s case, there are some complications specific to her situation. Urara’s deceased older sister Nagiko, Keiichi’s late wife, was deeply in love with Keiichi. However, Keiichi at one time had an affair with another woman. Upon discovering his affair, Nagiko was devastated, and committed suicide. Urara knows her sister’s devotion to Keiichi and her devastation. Further, because of this incident, Urara’s father hates Keiichi. It is understandable that Urara would feel somewhat guilty towards both her dead sister and her father if she gained happiness with Keiichi. Thus, Urara persistently uses oniisan as if telling herself the fact that Keiichi is no one but her brother-in-law.

However, this changes at the climax of the story. Urara tries to give up thinking about Keiichi, and decides to marry anyone decent through an arranged marriage. In modern Japan, when a woman reaches a tekireiki ‘marriageable age’, there is a certain degree of invisible, subtle pressure from society that it is ‘time to marry’ (Masaoka, 1994). After meeting several prospective husbands, one of them proposes to Urara, and she intends to accept his proposal, deciding to comply with the traditional idea of marriage in order to get over her feelings towards Keiichi. Keiichi does not know her true feelings, but senses that she does not look happy. One day, Urara goes to see the man to accept his proposal, but Keiichi tries to stop her. Finally, at this moment, Urara reveals her true feelings towards Keiichi. The following extract is their conversation. (In (7), K = Keiichi; U = Urara)

(7) 1 K: *Konna katachi de kekkonshitara, aite no kata ni*  
like.this form by marry-CD partner LK person to

2  *shitsurei daro?*  
rude suppose

‘If (you) marry like this, (it’s) disrespectful to the partner, don’t (you) think?’
3 U: Shooganai desho. Watashi ga sukina hito wa it cannot be helped suppose 1PP SUB love person TOP
4 torampu no baba mitaini, sekai de ichiban trump.cards LK joker like world LOC first
5 kekkonshicha ikenai hito nan da kara. should not marry person NOM BE because
6 ‘It cannot be helped because the person I love is the joker in the card deck, the last person who (I) should marry.’

7 K: …Dooyuu imi?
   how mean
   ‘…What do (you) mean?’

8 U: ….Watashi wa ne…..
   1PP TOP SFP
   ‘…I…, you know…”

9 K: ……..
   ‘…..’

10 U: …Anata no koto ga…. suki nano.
    2PP: anata LK NOM SUB love SFP
    ‘…You (anata) are the person (I) love.’

11 K: …………E!?
    what
    ‘………What?!’

12 U: Ima made, soo janai, soo janai, dame da dame now until so BE-NEG so BE-NEG no good BE no good da tte jibun no kimochi o osaetekita kedo…..
    BE QT self LK feeling OBJ have suppressed but
dame datta. Soo sureba suruhodo, sukini natchatte…
no.good was so the.more.(I).do.the.more.(I).become.to.love
‘Until now, (I tried to think) “It’s not, it’s not, don’t, don’t”, and have
suppressed my own feelings…but it didn’t work. The more I did so, the more
I came to love (you)…”

13 K: ……..
‘……’

(Kaseifu no Mita, 11)

In this extract, Urara finally decided to express her true feelings towards him, that it was
Keiichi whom she truly loved. At this moment, she did not address Keiichi as oniisan
‘brother’ anymore. Instead, she used anata explicitly. The use of anata, the absolute
specification of the addressee, is Urara’s declaration of rejecting the given brother-sister-
in-law relationship with Keiichi. Given the background to the whole situation, we see
that Urara’s use of anata here posts a significant message expressing her attitude. The
drama ends in an ambiguous way in terms of their future relationship. However, the
audience are led to assume that, from this special moment, they will start a new
relationship. The use of anata plays a very important role here as a signpost to end their
brother-sister-in-law relationship.

To summarise, in 6.2 we have seen that the use of anata functions to reject the
given social relationship between the interlocutors. In some cases, the term is observed
as the continuity of a speaker’s stance. In other cases, it is observed in a speaker’s
momentary emotional explosion. It can also be a strategic tool to express the speaker’s
attitude towards the addressee. In all examples, the speakers’ main concern is not to
acknowledge the given social relationship in a socially expected manner. On the contrary,
the use of anata, absolute specification of the second person entity, delivers an explicit
message that the speaker wishes to express an attitude of rejecting a given social relationship.

6.3. The use of *anata* in creating a special moment

6.3.1. The use of *anata* in giving advice

Given that the use of *anata*, the absolute specification of the second person, destabilises the value of relationship acknowledgement by explicitly renouncing it, it is understandable that its use creates a special moment in the immediate context of a conversation.

In Chapter 1, it was noted that the use of *anata* is infrequent in the daily conversation corpus. However, one of the conversations shows a higher frequency of the occurrence of *anata* compared to other conversations: the conversation between a student and a university professor when they are discussing the topic of the student’s paper. In their conversation, the professor is giving detailed advice. Observe the following example. (In (8), P = professor, S = student)

(8) 1 P: *Soo janakutte, anata wa, rizumu no tankyuu tte* so BE-NEG 2PP: *anata TOP rhythm LK pursue QT*

2 *itteru kono rizumu tte no o ittai donna mono* saying this rhythm QT NOM OBJ at.all what.kind.of thing

3 *o motte rizumu tte iu no ka tte iu koto o* OBJ hold rhythm QT say NOM QUE QT say thing OBJ

4 *moo ikkai kangaenaoshitemiru to ii to omou no.* more one.time try.to.rethink CD good QT think SFP

‘Not like that, but I think *you (anata)* should try to rethink this pursuit of rhythm, what kind of thing is regarded as rhythm at all.’

5 S: Hai
In this conversation, the male university professor gives advice about the topic of the student’s research paper. Regarding this, recall in Chapter 4 that we have discussed the use of anata when a superior speaker gives advice to an inferior addressee. We have seen situations described by the survey respondents, such as when a mother reprimands her children and a music teacher speaks to her student. To restate some comments, a music teacher reported “I usually use students’ names to refer to them but I think I often switch it to anata during my lessons saying, for example, anata no ima no oto wa ne…‘Your sound just now is…’. I don’t know why” (respondent 410). A student commented “my professor usually calls me by my surname but when I am called anata, I think it is something like when I am evaluated or he checks my dissertation etc.” (respondent 94). 

The above example conversation is the same situation that this respondent pointed out.

In fact, I was able to follow up with the above music teacher (respondent 410), as she wrote her contact details in the survey. In the survey, she wrote that on occasions she switched from using the student’s names to using anata but that she didn’t know why. She tried to reflect on it afterwards. The teacher explained that although she normally used ‘name-chan’ to refer to young children, it felt somehow too friendly during the lesson. She treated them as individual players in the lesson, thus she would spontaneously use anata. Her explanation is insightful in the sense that at the moment of giving serious advice, the speaker’s concern with acknowledging the existing relationship may not be the first priority.
Searle (1969) defines advice as a directive speech act in which one person tells another to change his/her behaviour. In this sense, the act of giving advice potentially threatens the receiver’s self-image (Locher, 2006; Morrow, 2006). Thus, giving advice has a common aspect with criticising an addressee. In the previous section, the use of anata was often observed when the speaker attacked or criticised the addressee (for example, (2) and (4)). In these situations, the speaker’s primary concern is not the acknowledgement of the interlocutors’ given social relationship. Rather, the use of anata explicitly expresses the speaker’s attitude of rejecting the given relationship. In advice-giving, which broadly includes reprimanding, the speaker may not have to ‘reject’ the usual relationship. However, the use of anata is a useful tool in order to create a certain distance. In doing so, the speaker can create a special moment and is able to convey an important message or teach an important point that is necessary for the addressee.

6.3.2. The use of anata in jocular utterances

In the data set, there are some cases where the speaker uses anata when criticising or challenging the addressee in a jocular manner. Recall from Chapter 4 that among respondents in their 10s and 20s who answered that they would use anata depending on the situation, almost half of them remarked on their use of anata when joking together or poking fun at each other.

The following example (9) is from a conversation between female students in their early 20s. Preceding this extract, they use their names as their default terms to refer to each other. During the conversation, B mentions Mooningu Musume, a group of young female pop-stars whom young Japanese people would usually recognize, because the
group always appears on TV. However, A was puzzled by what B was talking about, having no idea what *Mooningu Musume* was.

(9) 1 A: *Mooningu Musume toka wakaranai.*
     Morning.Musume etc. do.not.know
     ‘(I) don’t know of such a thing as *Morning Musume*’.

2 B: *Wakai n janai no, anata.* (laugh)
     young NOM BE-NEG QUE 2PP: anata
     ‘Aren’t you (*anata*) young?!’ (laughter)

3 A: *Gomen, atashi, kekko, kansei nanajissai gurai dakara.*
     sorry 1PP quite sensibility seventy.years.old about so

4 (laugh)
     ‘Sorry. I have a sensibility close to seventy years old, so… (laugh)’

(C39)

In the above example, B implies that A is young and therefore should know the TV idol group, treating this as common knowledge. B uses *anata* when she pokes fun at her friend by saying ‘Aren’t you (*anata*) young?!’ B uses an almost accusatory tone in making fun of A for not knowing of an idol group that all young Japanese people should know. *Anata* is used to create a special moment of ‘criticising’ the addressee by ignoring the use of the default reference term, but this is done in a jocular tone and with laughter.

Another example is a restatement of a conversation extract discussed in Chapter 4. It is also between young female students. They are talking about how to go back to their hometowns during the holiday.
(10) A: Watashi mo yooka ni Hikari de kaeru.
    1PP also 8th on Hikari by return
    ‘I will also go back on the 8th by the Hikari bullet train.’

    B: Shinkansen ka, kono kanemochi.
    bullet.train QUE this rich.person
    ‘Bullet train? This rich woman.’

A: (laugh) Nani yo anata, nan de kaeru noyo.
    what SFP 2PP: anata what by return SFP
    ‘Hey? How will you (anata) go back then?’

B: (laugh) Ko, koosoku basu.
    ex… express bus
    ‘Ex…..express bus.’

A: (laugh) Gambatte kudasai (laugh).
    good.luck
    ‘Good luck.’(laugh)

In this conversation, B calls A ‘a rich woman’ because A will use an expensive bullet train to go back to her hometown. A was offended at being labelled this way. The start of A’s second utterance nani yo anata ‘what? you (anata)...’ is a common initial phrase used to pick a fight and hence has a challenging tone. Recall an example we saw in the previous section. In the drama Kaseifu no Mita ‘Housekeeper Mita’, Keiichi, the father of the family, was angry with Mita for not showing any empathy towards him, and he expressed this by saying Nan nan desu ka, anata! ‘What the hell are you (anata)⁈’ The tone of utterance was as if he were picking a fight with her. He ignores his default
reference term Mita san ‘Ms Mita’ and instead uses anata. In example (11) here, anata is used in the same way. However, both A and B are having this conversation with laughter, so this is only a jocular conflict.

In both examples (9) and (10), what the speakers are superficially doing are face-threatening acts, such as criticising and challenging the addressee. In this sense, anata is used in the same way as discussed in previous sections. That is, it is used to reject given relationships by ignoring the use of default reference terms and to criticise or challenge the addressee. However, as the latter examples are done in a jocular manner, this type of utterance may be perceived differently. It is perceived as an accentuation of friendliness. This is probably the reason that young respondents in the survey reported that they would use anata when joking together or poking fun at each other in order to embed a special degree of friendliness.

Note that this usage tends to be found in a conversation between female speakers. This is presumably because vulgar forms are available for male speakers (Ide, 1990b) in this type of jocular utterances.

6.4. The use of anata to refer to an addressee’s core self

Thus far, we have seen that the use of anata displays the speaker’s attitude of renouncing the interlocutors’ given social relationship. This is made possible because the inherent property of anata is to absolutely specify the second person without displaying any social relationship between the interlocutors. This also means that anata functions ultimately and fundamentally to refer to an addressee’s core self, which strips social roles away. In this sense, it is unsurprising that the use of anata is observed at times when a speaker wants to sincerely convey his/her message to an addressee, not as
someone who has a certain social role in relation to the speaker, but as an absolute human being.

Let us look at another example (11) from *Kaseifu no Mita* ‘The Housekeeper Mita’. In this example, Keiichi, the father of the family, is talking to the housekeeper Mita on her last day, when the family is having a farewell party. As noted in Section 2, Keiichi’s default reference term for Mita is *Mita san* ‘Ms Mita’. However, when he expresses his sincere thanks from the bottom of his heart, he uses *anata* instead of *Mita san*. (In (11), K = Keiichi; M = Mita)

(11) 1 K: *Hontooni arigatoo. Boku ga kazoku o torimodoseta* really thank.you 1PP SUB family SUB could.regain
2 *no wa anata no okage desu. Moo jibun* NOM TOP 2PP: anata LK thanks.to BE any.more self
3 *o anmari semenaide kudasai. Kondo wa anata* OBJ do.not.blame.much please this.time TOP 2PP: anata
4 *ga shiawase ni naru ban desu. Anata ga* SUB happy RES become turn BE 2PP: anata SUB
5 *shiawase ni naranakattara boku wa shoochishimasen* happy RES not.become-CD 1PP TOP not.forgive
6 *kara ne.* so SFP

‘Thank you so much. The reason I could regain my family is thanks to you (*anata*). Please don’t blame yourself anymore. Now, it’s your (*anata no*) turn to be happy. If you (*anata*) don’t become happy, I won’t forgive (you), (I’m) telling (you).

9 M: *Shoochishimashita.* understood

‘Certainly.’

*(Kaseifu no Mita, 11)*
As mentioned earlier, Mita is a somewhat unusual person: she does not express her emotions because of past trauma. That said, she has done her job as a housekeeper perfectly, and in such a way as to quietly express her warmth towards each family member. All members of the family, especially Keiichi, are truly grateful to her for gradually fixing their dysfunctional family. Although Mita has never shown her emotions before this, she bursts into tears in this climactic scene and all of the family members cry as well. In this situation, Keiichi’s main concern is not to acknowledge the social relationship between himself and the housekeeper. Instead, by the use of anata, which has the ability to absolutely specify the second person, Keiichi is trying to reach Mita’s core self, without any focus on their social relationship. In doing so, he is conveying a sincere and heartfelt message to her not as their housekeeper but as an absolute human being. Anata’s property, absolute specification, serves to strip the interlocutors’ social elements away and connects them as human to human by referring to the addressee’s core self.

One view may still insist that Keiichi’s use of anata is a downward use of the term: Keiichi is the master of the household and Mita is the housekeeper who usually addresses Keiichi as goshujin sama ‘Master’. In other words, Keiichi is the superior in their contractual relationship. However, this account does not hold up to scrutiny because Mita also used anata towards Keiichi when she wanted to convey a sincere and direct message to him. Observe the following example (12). In a preceding episode, Keiichi’s youngest daughter behaved unreasonably and did something very dangerous. Keiichi saved her, but in the heat of the moment, he unintentionally slapped her due to an upsurge of emotion. That night, he regretted what he did and was blaming himself while he was talking to Mita. (In (12), K = Keiichi; M = Mita)
(12) K: *Ima made dare mo tataita koto nanka nakatta noni,*
now until anyone hit NOM TOP never.done although

2 *Kie ni anna koto shite..... Chichioya nara*
GN DAT that.kind.of thing do father CD

3 *dakishimeteyaru beki na noni...*
hold should NOM although

‘(I)’ve never hit anyone until today but (I) did such a thing to Kie.......Given
(I)’m her father, (I) should rather hold her....’

4 M: ............Kodomo ga warui koto o shitara, shikaru no
............child SUB bad thing OBJ do-CD scold NOM
ga atarimae desu.
SUB natural BE
‘............If a child does something wrong, it is natural (for you) to scold
him/her.’

5 K: *E?*
what
‘Pardon?’

6 M: *Anata ga... chichioya nara.......
2PP: anata SUB father CD
‘If you (anata) are.... a father.........’

*(Kaseifu no Mita, 4)*

Mita listens to Keiichi while he says that he did wrong by hitting Kie, his youngest
daughter. Mita is usually a woman of few words and does not engage in conversation.

She usually says only the bare minimum, such as ‘Certainly, master’ and ‘Breakfast is
ready’. However, at this moment, Mita defends Keiichi, saying that it is completely
natural that parents reprimand their child if the child does something they shouldn’t. By
saying this, she gives Keiichi the message ‘You are her father and given that, you did nothing wrong so don’t blame yourself’. In conveying this sincere and robust message, she momentarily chose not to refer to him as *goshujin sama* ‘master’ but absolutely specified Keiichi as an individual human being with the use of *anata*. Mita is trying to reach the addressee’s core self.

This function of *anata* can conceivably provide an explanation for the fact that *anata* is often observed in poems and songs. For example, consider the following song, which one of the survey respondents introduced to me. The title of the song is *Tegami–aisuru anata e*– ‘A letter–to dearest you (*anata*)–’, and the lyrics are written in the voice of a daughter who is about to marry, conveying her sincere thanks to her parents.

(13)  *Otoosan, okaasan,*

*Kyoo made watashi o taisetsuni sodatetekurete*

*Arigatoo*

[...]

*Otoosan,*

*Arubamu o mekuru to*

*Mada chiisana watashi*

*Anata ga daiteite*

*Ima dewa shiroi kami to shiwa ga sukoshi fueta anata*

*Nandaka setsunakute*

[...]

*Okaasan,*

*Anshinsuru koede*
‘Okaeri’tte nando mukaetekureta daroo

Anata ga atatakai sono te de tsukuru gohan

Nando isshoni tabeta daroo

‘Dad, Mum

Until today, for taking such dear care of me

Thank you

[...]

Dad,

When I open our album

There is a picture of little me

You (anata) are holding (me)

Recently, you (anata) have grey hair and wrinkles

I feel a little sad

[...]

Mum,

With a peaceful voice

Saying ‘welcome home’ many times to me

The meal you (anata) cook with (your) warm hands

How often we ate together’

(Maiko Fujita)

The uses of anata here are referring to the girl’s father and the mother. The songwriter initially addresses them with the socially normative terms otoosan ‘father’ and okaasan ‘mother’ in relation to her as a child. However, she also integrates the use of anata. The
use of *anata* here displays the girl’s attitude towards her mother and father. The girl who used to be a child and saw her parents only as ‘mum and dad’ is now a grown-up. She now sees her mother and father as individual human beings and wants to express her love and respect. In this song, the girl is trying to convey a sincere message to them not only as parents but also as absolute individual human beings. Here, her use of *anata*, which has an ability to absolutely specify the second person entity, serves to refer to the core self of the addressees. The use of *anata* strips their parent-child relationship away and conveys the girl’s message ‘I love, respect and thank you purely as human beings’.

Interestingly, a group of survey respondents in this study commented on *anata* as *kireina kotoba* ‘a beautiful word’. One of respondents wrote about the use of *anata* in songs as follows:

*Kashi ni anata ga haitteiru to kireina hyoogen da na to kanjiru. Soo saininshiki suru.*

‘When *anata* is included in song lyrics, I feel that it is a beautiful expression. I realise it (when I listen to the song).’

(Respondent 359)

Native speakers of Japanese would intuitively agree with this respondent’s comment. After observing the above song, in which the songwriter uses *anata* to refer to the core self of her parents and conveys a sincere message to them as absolute human beings, this respondent’s insight becomes clearer. When *anata* is used to refer to the addressee’s core self in conveying the speaker’s sincere message, it is felt ‘beautiful’ from an audience perspective.

In short, what we have seen in this section is that when a speaker wishes to convey a sincere and heartfelt message to the addressee, his/her main concern is not the
acknowledgement of the social elements between them. The social relationship between
the speaker and the addressee is not important. Instead, the speaker regards the
relationship as that of purely human to human and tries to reach the addressee’s core
self. Here, anata’s ability to absolutely specify the second person makes it possible for
the speaker to strip any social elements between the interlocutors away and refer to the
addressee’s core self. With the use of anata, the speaker is able to deliver a message
along the lines of ‘I’m not concerned about our social relationships, but am talking to
you purely as an absolute human being’. It can be said that the use of anata enables the
speaker to interact with the addressee’s existential self. This is precisely because anata
has a core property of absolute specification of the second person entity.

6.5. Summary

In this chapter, I have explored the use of anata in socially definable relationships. I
have shown how the use of anata, which has the inherent property of absolute
specification of the second person, interacts with cultural norms in socially definable
relationships and thereby creates various functions and effects. As supported by the
examples in this chapter, the notion of absolute specification can systematically account
for these functions and expressive effects.

By using anata, the speaker makes explicit the non-acknowledgement of any
social relationship between interlocutors. Thus, against the background of the norm-
governed personal reference system in Japanese communication, the use of anata comes
to function as a rejection mechanism of a given social relationship between interlocutors
and as a mechanism for the creation of a special moment in particular types of speech.
Further, the property of absolute specification of the second person ultimately makes it
possible for the speaker to reference the addressee’s core self, treating the addressee purely as an individual human being without considering their socially constructed elements. Given the above, the use of anata delivers messages such as ‘I wish to ignore or reject the given social relationship between us’ and ‘I’m not concerned about your social elements, but am talking to you as an absolute human being’.

Throughout this chapter, I have constantly recalled the importance of socio-cultural norms in the system of personal reference in Japanese communication. At the same time, I have shown that the formulation of a speaker’s personal reference also involves a choice. In different languages and cultures, person reference is said to give scope for “bending and manipulation of otherwise idealized categories of social relationships” (Garde, 2013: 10).41 That said, it does not mean that the choice of personal reference is a disorganised pursuit of an individual’s random interests. As Heritage (1984: 117) states, “normative accountability is the ‘grid’ by reference to which whatever is done will become visible and assessable”.

In this chapter, I have explained the mechanisms of how the use of anata, absolute specification of the second person, interacts with cultural norms as the grid, and creates various functions and effects due to the very existence of a norm. I have shown that in a society where relationship acknowledgement is almost mandatory in communication, the absolute specification of the addressee is a unique property and its use creates expressive effects. Given the discussion of social norms and the revealed inherent property of anata, its functions and effects, we are now able to understand why anata has been said to be a “touchy” word with “multi-meanings” (Jinnouchi, 1998: 40) and

41 Garde (2013) makes the above comment regarding classificatory kinship in Aboriginal Australia. See also Luong (1990), Maynard (2000, 2001a, 2001b, 2001c), Sacks and Shegloff (2007).
hence “unique” (Jung, 1999: 26) and “difficult to use” (Miwa, 2010: 4) in the previous literature and among native speakers.
Chapter 7

A case study:
The use of *anata* in parliamentary debate

7.1. Introduction

In Chapters 5 and 6, I examined the use of *anata* with reference to its functions and effects in various contexts in both socially undefinable and definable relationships. In this chapter, I will case study the use of *anata* in parliamentary debate. Whereas there is only infrequent use of *anata* in everyday conversations, abundant examples of its use are observed in parliamentary debate. In this chapter, the functions of *anata* that have been discussed thus far are attested to in a parliamentary setting. The analysis will reveal why the use of *anata*, having the nature of the absolute specification of the second person, is seen infrequently in daily conversations but occurs with a higher frequency in this particular genre of verbal interaction.

The chapter is organised as follows. Section 7.2 will explore the details of the data. Section 7.3 will overview the types of address terms conventionally used in the Japanese Diet. Section 7.4 will show distributional facts of *anata’s* functions. Section 7.5 will discuss the use of *anata* in socially undefinable relationships, examining its use in referring to a general audience, an impersonal entity or an unfamiliar addressee. Section 7.6 is devoted to a discussion of socially definable relationships. *Anata* is used in the parliamentary context to reject a given status relationship in which each member
possesses a clearly assigned institutional position. This constitutes a form of power struggle by the speakers. Section 7.7 is a summary.

7.2. Data

The data used in the analysis for this case study is extracted from *Kokkai Kaigiroku* ‘Minutes of the Japanese Diet’. The huge volume of minutes includes all meetings in both the *Shuugiin* ‘House of Representatives’ and the *Sangiin* ‘House of Councillors’ since the opening of the National Diet in 1890. While the minutes of the Japanese Diet are a useful research source for scholars who study areas such as pre/post war politics and history, utilising the minutes for linguistic analysis is in fact a relatively new activity (Matsuda, 2008). Since 2001, when the minutes were made available online as ‘Minutes of the Japanese Diet Retrieval System’ and became easy to access, the number of linguists using the minutes has increased (for example, Matsuda (2004; 2008), Yamamoto and Adachi (2005), Usui (2005), Kagetsu (2008), Mogi, (2008), Sano (2008), and Yonezawa (2014)).

Although the minutes of parliamentary debates are widely used for linguistic analysis across different languages, there are some issues of their use in this area that have been pointed out (Slembrouck, 1992; Ilie, 2001; Matsuda, 2008; Kim 2012). For example, the official records of the British parliament ‘Hansard’ are known to be not necessarily verbatim (Slembrouck, 1992; Ilie, 2001). Slembrouk (1992: 104-106) notes that the characteristics of spoken language such as false starts, incomplete utterances and (un)filled pauses are filtered out in the records and informal language is amended into formal and standardised English in the minutes.

42 http://kokkai.ndl.go.jp
Similar issues are found in the Minutes of the Japanese Diet (Matsuda, 2008).\footnote{For more detailed analysis of the difference between the actual utterances and the minutes, see Matsuda (2008).} First, so-called *fukisoku hatsugen* ‘irregular remarks’ or jeering, including rude or irrelevant remarks, may be deleted. Second, fillers such as *ee, aa, anoo, sonoo* are not picked up for transcription. Third, some particles may be modified, deleted or added. Fourth, grammatical errors, misreads of documents, some repetitive utterances and mistakes in quotation may be fixed. Given these edits, Matsuda (2008) states that the Diet minutes have aspects of written language in the sense that the transcriber’s perspective is reflected in consideration of grammatical correctness as well as conformance to the ethical guidelines. In this sense, the transcribed minutes are not suitable as the only source of data for an analysis of filler, back channels, particles, repetition, swear words and so on. That said, a number of spoken features still remain as they are in the minutes. Most importantly, each meeting is broadcast on TV, recorded and made available online. Thus, it is possible to check if the transcription is exactly what is uttered by utilising the combination of minutes and videos. In terms of personal reference terms appearing in the minutes, including the use of *anata*, to the best of my observations by checking them against the video, they are scripted in the same way as they are uttered in the actual talks seen in the video clips. Example sentences I have used are all verbatim from the minutes as checked against the video.

For the data of the current study, I limited it to a single year (February 25th 2012 – February 25th 2013) and searched for the occurrence of *anata* in the various meetings held throughout the year, using the database search system. Two hundred and eighty-seven meetings came up as ‘hits’. There were seven meetings where only plural forms
anatatachi or anatagata occurred, so I excluded these meetings in order to focus on the use of the singular form anata.\textsuperscript{44} The well-established search system allowed me to quite easily find dialogues in which the use of anata occurs, allowing me to identify the specific meeting, the context and which politicians were involved. I then referred to these dialogues in the relevant video recordings. Using this process, I was able to look at a large number of dialogues which include the occurrence of anata.

The target term anata appeared one thousand six hundred and fourteen times in total. However, it should be noted that counting the occurrence of anata and rating its frequency against the whole number of tokens of address terms in the entire dialogue is not helpful for the current analysis. This is because parliamentary meetings include a number of modes of speech, including lengthy parts where the speaker reads out a prewritten script as well as conventionally fixed conversational exchanges at the start of the meeting and so forth. It is not my intention to discuss the frequency of the occurrence of anata in the entire tokens or in comparison to other personal reference terms. The aim of this case study is to take a close look at anata’s distributional facts based on its functions. In other words, it aims to reveal what functions of anata occur to what degree in parliamentary debate. Section 7.4 will show this in detail.

\textsuperscript{44} In Chapter 5, I stated the reason for excluding plural forms from my analysis, but I restate it here. Plural forms of personal reference terms are made by adding suffixes to the end of a term in Japanese. In the case of anata, suffixes –tachi or –gata can be used. Anatatachi and anatagata are both second person plural forms. Between the two, the suffix –gata has a higher degree of formality and is hence used with a somewhat more respectful nuance than anatatachi (Morita, 1989). As for –tachi, because it does not carry any respectful nuance (Morita, 1989), anatatachi cannot be used to refer to a group of people to whom the speaker should show respect. Given these facts, the use of the plural form anatagata or anatatachi would result in having certain social placedness and would narrow down the possible group of addressees.
7.3. Personal reference terms in parliament

In parliamentary meetings across the world, Members of Parliament (MPs) generally refer to each other “by means of a relatively restricted and well-defined range of parliamentary forms of address” (Ilie, 2010: 885). Ilie goes on to state that:

> It is the knowledge, internalisation and application of particular sets of conventional rules that shape and reflect the authority and activities carried out by institutionally and politically established groups of professionals.

(Ilie, 2010: 886)

In the Japanese Diet, the conventional norm is to use institutional titles (Kim, 2012). They include terms such as *naikaku soori daijin* ‘prime minister’, *soori* ‘prime minister’ (i.e. a shorter version of *naikaku soori daijin*), *daijin* ‘minister’, *iinchoo* ‘chairman of the committee’, and *gichoo* ‘the speaker (president) of the house’ (Kim, 2012: 24). When a personal name is used, it is only in combination with gender-neutral titles such as *-kun*45 and *-san*, or in institutional titles with last name or with the full name (but first name is not used (ibid)). *Sensei*, which literally means ‘teacher’ and is also used to refer to a medical doctor, a lawyer, a politician and other authoritative figures (Ide, 2006; cf. Chapter 3), is also used by politicians when referring to each other. However, this is more so outside the parliament rather than inside the parliament. Given these general rules, it could be presumed that the use of *anata* would be quite restricted. From the next section, I show how and when *anata* is used in the parliamentary context.

---

45 The suffix *-kun* is more often added to a male addressee’s name in an everyday conversation, however in an institutional setting, a male superior may refer to a female inferior addressee using *-kun*, entailing a highly authoritative tone. In the Diet, it is conventionally used by a committee chair to refer to MPs regardless of their gender.
7.4. Distributional facts

The Table (1) below shows distributional facts of *anata*’s functions. The total number of occurrences of *anata* in the data examined is one thousand six hundred and fourteen. I divided these occurrences into the same use categories as discussed in Chapters 5 and 6, that is, the use of *anata* in a socially undefinable relationship and a definable relationship.

(1) The occurrence of *anata* in parliamentary debates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usages</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socially undefinable relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Reported speech</em></td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Referring to an unfamiliar addressee</em></td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially definable relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rejecting a given relationship</em></td>
<td>1099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

First, in a socially undefinable relationship, 10.8% of the occurrences of *anata* are a non-deictic use, namely, its use is observed in reported speech. This is indicated as ‘reported speech’ in Table (1) above and includes cases where the use of *anata* refers to a general audience and a non-specific addressee (impersonal use of *anata*) in a reported speech.46 These cases will be discussed in sections 7.5.1 and 7.5.2 respectively. Further, the use of *anata* in reported speech also includes the case where the addressee is a

---

46 There are only a few cases where the speaker in the reported speech refers to a specific individual in the assumed situation or recollected situation. This use of *anata* is functionally categorised as ‘rejecting a given relationship’.
collective entity. In my data, this use is observed only in the Diet minutes. Thus, I have added a separate section 7.5.3. to discuss this use.

Second, 21\% of the uses of \textit{anata} refer to an unfamiliar addressee in the immediate conversational context (i.e. not in a reported speech). In parliamentary debate, there are occasions where the House of Councilors and the House of Representatives call for \textit{shoonin kanmon} ‘summoning of a witness’ to investigate a particular case. The investigation may involve an assessment of criminal liability. The addressee in \textit{shoonin kanmon} is treated as if he/she is an unfamiliar person in the sense that the process starts by asking his/her name, social position and so forth. This case will be discussed in section 7.5.4. Note that the number of occasions of \textit{shoonin kanmon} varies depending on the year. This means that the percentage of this use of \textit{anata} may vary depending on how frequently \textit{shoonin kanmon} occurs in a given year.

Finally, 68.2\% of the use of \textit{anata} occurs in a socially definable relationship. Here, the use of \textit{anata} functions to reject a given social relationship between the interlocutors. Except for the \textit{shoonin kanmon} occasions mentioned earlier, the status relationship between a speaker and an addressee is normally clear in the Diet (e.g. the speaker is an ordinary MP and the addressee is the prime minister). In this circumstance, the use of \textit{anata} unavoidably indicates that the speaker is challenging the convention and hence means a rejection of the given relative social positions. This case will be discussed in section 7.6. Section 7.7 is a summary.
7.5. The use of *anata* in a socially undefinable relationship

7.5.1. The use of *anata* to refer to a general audience

In Chapter 5, I discussed the use of *anata* to refer to a general audience. We have seen some examples of this use in advertisements and I have also noted that *anata* is used in official documents such as questionnaires to refer to a general audience.

In the nature of a Diet hearing, politicians sometimes necessarily include phrases from these official documents in their dialogue, in order to present evidence for a topic under discussion. The use of *anata* in surveys and official notifications is observed as a form of reported speech in MP’s talk. The following example (2) illustrates this. Here, a politician is criticising a survey published by Osaka city and distributed to its citizens. He insists that the contents breach a civilian’s right to have freedom of thought.

(2) 1 Y: Kore ga oosaka shi no ankeeto choosa sonomono desu kedo this SUB Osaka city LK questionnaire survey itself BE but
2 koko ni wa anata wa kumiai katsudoo ni sankashita here LOC TOP 2PP: anata TOP union activity in participate
3 koto ga arimasu ka toka, anata wa tokutei no seijika have.experienced QUE and 2PP: anata TOP particular LK politician
4 o ooensuru katsudoo ni sankashita koto ga arimasu ka nado OBJ support activity in participate have.experienced QUE etc.
5 kokojin no shisoo ya kanga e kokoro no naka ni made individual LK ideology and thought heart LK inside LOC even
6 fumikomu choosa koomoku ga takusan fukumarete orimasu. break.into survey item SUB many are.included

‘This is the survey itself from Osaka city. This includes a lot of question items which ask about one’s ideology and step inside of one’s heart such as ‘Have you *(anata)* ever participated in a particular union activity?’ and
‘Have you *(anata)* ever participated in activities to support a particular politician?’ and so on.’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 13/03/2012)

In the above example, *anata* is used in embedded sentences extracted from the questionnaire under discussion. Two sentences

\[
anata wa kumiai katsudoo ni sankashita koto ga arimasu ka
\]

‘Have you *(anata)* ever participated in a particular union activity?’ in line 2 and

\[
anata wa tokutei no seijika o ooensuru katsudoo ni sankashita koto ga arimasu ka
\]

‘Have you *(anata)* ever participated in activities to support a particular politician?’ in lines 3-4 are quoted from the questionnaire. Note that the embedded phrases may not necessarily be the exact words published in the questionnaire (cf. Section 5.4). The point is that the use of *anata*, which has the property of absolute specification, does not imply any particular social elements about the addressees who are the receivers of the questionnaire. It refers to a general audience only.

Example (3) below shows the same way of reporting a phrase from an official letter in order to explain what the speaker wants to demonstrate, although in this case, the official notification letter under discussion is not the letter itself but a pseudo-letter. The speaker is talking about issues related to an employee’s pension fund. Preceding this extract, the speaker was demonstrating an enormous loss of three trillion yen through the pension board under The Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. He criticises the system of pension fund management in which the loss is covered by individual contractors, despite the fact that there is no notification regarding how much of their premium is in fact there just to cover the loss.

(3) 1 O: *Desukara, keiyakusha ga rokusenman nin to shimashitara,*

\[
\text{so contractant SUB sixty.million people QT suppose-CD}
\]
So, if (we) suppose that contractors are sixty million people, (it would) be fifty thousand yen per person. Naturally, according to the conditions of the aforementioned law, a report or an official letter which says “You (anata) are required to pay fifty thousand yen per person” will never come (to them) as a system’.

(Budgetary committee meeting, 16/03/2012)

In lines 1 and 2, the speaker exemplifies the situation saying that if there are sixty million contractors covering the loss of three trillion yen, then fifty thousand yen per person is required to cover the cost. This estimate is not notified to contractors by a letter or an official notification document. In line 4, the speaker creates a phrase in a pseudo-letter hitori goman en anata ni seikyuusaremasu yo ‘You (anata) are required to pay fifty thousand yen per person’, discussed as an item which should be sent to the contractors but would never come under the current system. Anata is used here to refer to the general audience of contractors in the pseudo-letter (i.e. a ‘Dear customers’ letter). Anata’s property of absolute specification works merely to specify the addressee as a part of a general audience without any implication regarding the receivers’ age, gender and social status. This is the same use as in the actual questionnaire discussed in (2). Given that in
parliamentary meetings, where discussion of a particular document in a dialogue can be more frequent than in everyday conversations, it is understandable that we tend to find this use of *anata* in the data.

### 7.5.2. Impersonal use of *anata*

In this section, I discuss the impersonal use of *anata* which refers to a non-specific individual in reported speech. The nature of parliamentary talk allows this use to occur abundantly. This is because when a speaker needs to explain a situation under discussion, he/she often tends to embed an imaginary dialogue in his/her talk so that the hearer can shift their perspective on the described situation according to the roles played by the imaginary characters. *Anata*’s property of absolute specification of the second person allows it to play a suitable role of the nameless actor in the described situation without indicating any aspects of this imaginary actor’s social elements.

Let us look at the following example. In example (4) below, the speaker is talking about how citizens think about *chihoo bunken* ‘decentralisation’. He describes his experience of randomly asking people about it.

(4) 1 T: *Tatoeba, nin’i no hito ni chihoo bunken to iu no*  
for.example random LK person DAT decentralisation QT say NOM  
2 *wa anata sansei desu ka hantai desu ka to*  
TOP 2PP: *anata* agree BE QUE disagree BE QUE QT  
3 *iu to sansei da to iu n desu yo.*  
say QT agree BE QT say NOM BE SFP  
‘For example, if (I) ask a random person about decentralisation “Do you *(anata)* agree or disagree?”*, (he/she) says “agree”.’

(Surveillance committee meeting, 23/04/2012)
The speaker who is asking the addressee a question ‘Do you (anata) agree or disagree?’ in the described situation is the current speaker himself. The assumed addressee is a single but unspecified individual. The speaker is acting out the experienced situation with the use of anata. The above example (4) takes the form of direct reported speech as indicated by the fact that the embedded part has the polite sentence ending desu with a question marker ka (cf. Chapter 5), as shown in Anata wa sansei desu ka hantai desu ka ‘Do you (anata) agree or disagree?’ If anata is replaced by any other second person pronouns here, impersonality would be lost. For example, if the speaker uses a vulgar form omae, saying Omae sansei, hantai? ‘Do you (omae) agree or disagree?’, the reported speech restricts our interpretation. The use of omae only fits a plain style of sentence and the reported part sounds as if the speaker is talking informally to his mate or a younger addressee. It is not possible to use omae here with the same impersonal effect that the use of anata creates. As anata absolutely specifies the second person, it serves to refer to a non-specific individual only as a mere addressee without displaying social elements of the interlocutors in the described situation.

Another example provided in (5) below is not a situation the speaker actually experienced, but is describing the situation as if she had seen it so that the hearer or the audience of the parliament could picture the scene. Preceding this extract, the speaker talked about issues of providing childcare facilities to families with small children. The applicants’ situations are assessed by the local government to see if they are eligible to leave their children at given childcare facilities. Depending on the facilities and circumstances of each family, the hours for leaving children are restricted.
In the above example (5), by saying anata wa choojikan ‘you (anata) are long hours’ and anata wa tanjikan ‘you (anata) are short hours’, the speaker is describing the situation in which a bureaucrat is informing each applicant of the results of their application. It is not an actual situation experienced by the speaker: rather she is acting out a bureaucrat talking to each applicant in an imaginary scene. With the use of anata, the social elements of the addressee in the described situation are not displayed. Thus, the addressee appears as a mere individual in the described scene.

The uses of anata shown in examples (4) and (5) tend to be observed in parliamentary talk when an MP is explaining a situation under discussion. It is one of an MP’s speech techniques by which he/she can dramatise a scene, where anata plays the role of an unspecified single addressee (e.g. person A, B and C). Anata’s property of absolute specification of the second person again serves to refer to a non-specific individual without displaying particular social elements such as gender and age.
7.5.3. Referring to a collective entity

Interestingly, in parliamentary debate, there are cases where the use of *anata* is extended to refer to collective/organisational entities (vs. individual human entities). The referents include entities such as institutions, governments, and nations. Observe the following example (6). The topic is about a negotiation between local governments and traders who are willing to deal with debris disposal after the tsunami of 2011. Preceding this extract, the speaker S was talking about the national government’s obligation regarding the explanation of a number of detailed regulations about the classifications of the debris and its treatment.

(6) 1 S: *Kore, shikkari setsumeishinakya dame nan desu yo.*
    this properly have.to.explain NOM BE SFP
  2 *Kuni ga, uketoru shichooson ni anata*
    nation SUB receive cites.towns.village DAT 2PP: anata
  3 *setsumeishite yattekure to itta n ja kore, muri desu yo.*
    explain-IMP QT say-CD this impossible BE SF
    ‘(Regarding) this, (the national government) has to explain properly. If the
    national government just tells cities, towns and villages like “you (anata)
    explain it (to your local traders)”, it’s impossible.’

    (Tohoku Earthquake and Tsunami Reconstruction committee meeting, 27/03/2012)

In this example, the speaker is insisting in line 1 that the national government must explain the regulations precisely to the local government. He goes on to state that it is impossible for cities, towns and villages (i.e. local government) to explain everything to local traders if the national government leaves everything in the local government’s charge without a thorough explanation. In line 2, he describes the situation as if the national government is talking to the local government *anata setsumeishite yatte kure*
‘you (anata) explain it (to traders)’. Anata is used here to refer to shichooson ‘local government’ (lit. cities, towns and villages).

Similarly, in example (7) below, it is observed that the implied referent is an institution. The speaker is talking about the perceived irresponsible attitude of both the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Law regarding the judicial examination system.

(7) 1 Y: Dakara wareware kara miru to monbushoo wa so we from see CD Ministry.of.Education TOP
2 ittai nani yatteita no to tomoni, hoomushoo nani on.earth what was.doing SFP as.well.as Ministry.of.Justice what
3 yatteita no to. Moo tatewari gyroosei no was.doing SFP QT Indeed vertical administration LK
4 mama de, anata ni omakase ne to kooiu fuuni state on 2PP: anata DAT leave SFP QT like.this
5 shika mienai wake desu ne. only cannot.look reason BE SFP

‘So, from our perspective, (it’s like) “What on the earth was the Ministry of Education doing?”’, as well as “What was the Ministry of Justice doing?”’

‘Indeed, it is still based on a vertical administration and it only looks like “(I) will leave it to you (anata), OK?”’

(Judicial Affairs committee meeting, 31/07/2012)

In example (7) above, by saying ‘What was the Ministry of Education doing?’ and ‘What was the Ministry of Justice doing?’ in lines 1-3, the speaker expresses that neither the Ministry of Education nor the Ministry of Justice have a sense of responsibility for the systemic failure of judicial examinations. The speaker is pointing out that both ministries take a stance of mutual recrimination. He describes this by saying anata ni omakase ne
‘you (anata) do it, thanks’ in line 4. Here, anata is used to refer to ‘the other party’ from both perspectives. That is, anata is the Ministry of Education from the perspective of the Ministry of Justice and at the same time, it is the Ministry of Justice from the perspective of the Ministry of Education. Anata’s property of absolute specification serves here to simply indicate ‘the other party’.

Further, example (8) below shows the use of anata to refer to a nation. The speaker is talking about Hoppooryoodo mondai ‘the Northern Territory dispute’ 47 and recommending the Foreign Minister to seek help from the United States.

(8) 1 I: Zehi, kono kooshoo no kekka o teinei ni seijitsu ni, by.all.means this negotiation LK result OBJ politely sincerely
2 soshite, anata no tasuke ga hitsuyoona n da to and 2PP: anata LK help SUB necessary NOM BE QT
3 iu koto o amerika ni iu koto da to omoimasu.

say NOM OBJ America to say NOM BE QT think
‘By all means, (explain) the results of this negotiation properly and sincerely, and then I think (you) should say “(we) need your help” to America.’

(Diplomatic Defense committee meeting, 26/07/2012)

In this example, the speaker is saying that Japan should express anata no tasuke ga hitsuyoo na n da ‘(we) need your (anata no) help’ to the U.S. To refer to Amerika ‘the U.S.’, anata is used. In the same way as in examples (6) and (7), the use of anata here serves to refer to the other party from the speaker’s perspective in the described situation.

In all examples (6), (7) and (8) in this section, anata refers to a collective entity: in (6), it is a local government from the national government’s perspective; in (7), it is

47 This is also known as the ‘Kuril Islands dispute’ between Japan and Russia and includes some individuals of the Ainu people. The dispute is over the land ownership of the South Kuril Islands.
the Ministry of Education from the Ministry of Law’s perspective and vice versa; and in (8), it is the United States from Japan’s perspective. The use of anata here refers to these entities merely as ‘the other party’ or ‘the opponent’ from one perspective in the described situation. As discussed previously, anata’s property of absolute specification of the addressee means that it serves to refer to a general audience or non-specific individuals only as mere addressees without displaying any social elements of the interlocutors. Similarly, the use of anata here does not imply relative positions between the described entities. Instead, it serves to simply refer to the other party from one side’s perspective in each described situation.

Thus far, we have looked at the use of anata when referring to a general audience, a non-specific individual and a collective entity. These uses appear in a form of reported speech in the category of socially undefinable relationships. In the next section, I will discuss the rest of this category, that is, the case where the use of anata refers to an unfamiliar addressee in the immediate context of conversations (i.e. not in reported speech).

7.5.4. Referring to an unfamiliar addressee

As mentioned briefly in section 7.4, in the Japanese Diet, there are occasions when shoonin kanmon ‘summoning of a witness’ is required to investigate a particular matter. In shoonin kanmon, the witness is treated as an unfamiliar person, that is, the speaker tends to avoid any socially indexical terms such as the witnesses’ name along with any suffixes, titles or occupational terms. The session usually starts by asking for the witness’s name, occupation and so forth. The witness, for example, may claim him/herself as ‘CEO’ of a company. However, the questioner does not go on to refer to
him/her with occupational terms or position titles (such as *shachoo* ‘president’) as they would in an ordinary situation. In this sense, the use of *anata* in a parliamentary witness summons is the same as that in a courtroom setting, where the addressee’s social position is not the main concern of the questioner. Observe the following example (9). It is at the start of *shoonin kanmon*.

(9) 1 O: *Anata* wa Asakawa Kazuhiko kun gohonnin desu ka.

2PP: *anata* TOP FN GN Mr. himself BE QUE

‘Are you (*anata*) Mr. Kazuhiko Asakawa, the said person?’

2  A: *Hai, soo degozaimasu.*

yes so BE-HON

‘Yes, I am.’

(Financial committee meeting, 24/04/2012)

In line 1, *anata* is used to refer to the addressee without specifying any potential social elements. Mr. Asakawa is the CEO of an investment company who allegedly window-dressed its financial statements. Asakawa’s criminal liability has been questioned in the media. After confirming his identity, members of the parliament take it in turn to question him.

During question time, the questioners do not address Asakawa as *shachoo* ‘president’ or Asakawa-san ‘Mr. Asakawa’ but rather they continue to use *anata* to address him. In the following example (10), the speaker is asking where Asakawa met another witness Nishikawa.

(10) 1 O: *Somosomo anata* wa Nishimura shoonin to wa,

2PP: *anata* TOP FN witness with TOP
Example (10) is similar to a lawyer asking questions to an accused or witness in a courtroom. That is to say, by using anata, the speaker is specifying the addressee as a ‘mere’ second person without indicating any associated social elements, whether the addressee claims him/herself a CEO of a company or is accused of being a criminal. In a court, all individuals are placed equally as individuals before the judges regardless of their claimed social status. Likewise, in shoonin kanmon, the witnesses are placed equally before questioners and the audience as mere individuals regardless of their social identity. The use of anata expresses the speaker’s attitude of detachment in treating addressees as mere individuals, by not acknowledging any social relationship with the addressee.

Thus far, I have covered the use of anata in socially undefinable relationships, which occupy 31.8% of all occurrences of anata in the Diet Minutes data. The rest of the occurrences (62.8%) are categorised as being in a socially definable relationship. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to the discussion of this category.
7.6. The use of *anata* in a socially definable relationship

7.6.1. The rejection of a given social relationship

In Chapter 6, I showed how the use of *anata*, because it does not indicate the interlocutors’ social elements, serves for the speaker to make explicit the non-acknowledgement of the relative social status between them. This in turn functions to express the speaker’s attitude of rejection of a given social relationship. For example, as discussed in Section 6.2, a student who did not want to accept a new home tutor referred to the tutor as *anata* instead of using *sensei* ‘teacher’. A younger brother struggling to accept his older sister referred to her as *anata* instead of *aneki* ‘older sister’. A father became angry with the housekeeper and referred to her as *anata* instead of his default reference term *Mita san* ‘Ms Mita’.

This function of the use of *anata*, namely the rejection of a given social relationship, is particularly frequent in parliamentary debates relative to all occurrences of *anata* in the Diet Minutes. As seen in Table (1) (c.f. Section 7.4), among all the occurrences of *anata*, 68.2% are classified as having this function. In parliamentary debate, cases where this use of *anata* occurs tend to be where the speaker attempts to disregard an addressee’s given position, to scorn the addressee, or to attack the addressee emotionally. Looking at example (11), we can observe the speaker’s wish to disqualify the addressee from the addressee’s current position and urge the addressee’s resignation with the use of *anata*.

(11) a. *Sore ga dekinu naraba, anata wa daijin no shikaku*  
that SUB cannot CD 2PP: *anata* TOP minister LK qualification  
wa nai.  
TOP absent
‘If (you) cannot do that, you (anata) don’t have the qualification to be a minister (you don’t deserve to be a minister).’

(Financial results meeting, 22/08/2012)

b. Haji o shiranai no ka ne, anata wa.

shame OBJ do.not.know LK QUE SFP 2PP: anata TOP

Jinin suru tsumori wa arimasen ka.

resign intention TOP do.not.have QUE

‘Don’t you (anata) have shame? Do (you) have any intention to resign?’

(Environmental committee, 17/04/2012)

c. Watashi no keiken ja, sore dake de anata moo

1PP LK experience TOP that only with 2PP: anata already

kanboochookan shikkaku desu yo.

the.Chief.Cabinet.Secretary failure BE SFP

‘In my experience, you (anata) are already a failure as the Chief Cabinet Secretary only for that.’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 18/04/2012)

d. Nande anata wa yamenai no.

why 2PP: anata TOP do.not.resign SFP

Yametatte ii janai ka, kore gurai no koto o yatte.

even.resign good BE-NEG QUE this degree LK thing OBJ do

‘Why don’t you (anata) resign? (You) should resign, by doing such a thing.’

(Special meeting for consumers’ issues, 23/03/2012)

In these examples (11a) to (11d), anata co-occurs with expressions such as shikaku wa nai ‘not qualified’ in (11a), jinin suru ‘resign’ in (11b), shikkaku ‘failure’ in (11c) and yameru ‘quit’ in (11d). In these utterances where the speakers are demanding the Prime Minister or minister resign, it makes perfect sense that the speakers choose not to use the addressee’s position titles but instead use anata. The use of anata expresses the
speaker’s attitude of non-acknowledgement of the hearer’s position, hence rejecting it. In doing so, the speaker delivers messages such as ‘you don’t deserve to be referred to as prime minister’ and ‘I don’t accept you as the prime minister’.

Similarly, the examples shown next in (12) show the use of *anata* with negatively evaluative expressions directed towards the addressee.

(12) a. Kitai hazure da na, anata wa.

disappointment BE SFP 2PP: anata TOP

‘You (anata) are a disappointment.’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 09/07/2012)

b. Sore wa mattaku anata ja muri da.

that TOP totally 2PP: anata TOP incapable BE

‘You (anata) are totally incapable of that.’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 26/03/2012)

c. Kore dake ittemo mada wakattenai n desu anata wa.

this degree say still do.not.understand NOM BE 2PP: anata TOP

Tondemonai anata no sono shisei ga, tondemonai daijin o outrageous 2PP: anata LK that attitude SUB outrageous minister OBJ unde kuru n desu yo.

produce come NOM BE SFP

‘You (anata) still haven’t understood (it) even (though I) said (it) this much. That attitude of you (anata) who is outrageous ends up producing outrageous ministers, (I’m telling you).’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 04/04/2012)

In these examples, the speakers’ negative evaluations are expressed by a variety of words and phrases such as *kitaihazure* ‘disappointment’ (lit. ‘failure against an expectation’) in (12a), *muri* ‘incapable’ in (12b) and *tondemonai* ‘outrageous’ in (12c). Again, the use
of *anata* is a powerful tool in expressing the speakers’ attitude of ignoring, dismissing and rejecting the given status relationships.

There are additional examples which are almost like parting shots where *anata* co-occurs with offensive words.

(13) a. *Anata wa kembooshoo janai n desu ka.*

2PP: *anata* TOP amnesia BE-NEG NOM BE QUE

‘Do you (*anata*) have amnesia?’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 15/03/2012)

b. *Anata ne, kikarete mo inai shitsumon ni tonchinkanna koto kotaete…*

2PP: *anata* SFP not.ask-PASS question to irrelevant thing kotaete…

answer

‘**You (anata)** answered rubbish to questions (you) were not even asked…’

(Budgetary committee meeting, 04/04/2012)

c. *Nani o itteru n desu ka, anata wa!*

what OBJ is.saying NOM BE QUE 2PP: *anata* TOP

*Neboketa yoona koto o!*

half.asleep like thing OBJ

‘What are (you) talking about, **you (anata)**, such sleep-talk?!’

(Committee meeting for Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries: 08/11/2012)

In example (13a), the speaker’s expression *kembooshoo* ‘amnesia’ is a deliberately offensive expression. In (13b), while the word *tonchinkan* is translated as ‘irrelevant’ in English, it actually has a rather more foolish tone as in ‘nincompoop’. In both examples (13a) and (13b), the speaker’s attitude of derision towards the addressee is expressed and the utterances have an offensively scornful tone. (13c) is a restatement of example
(2) in Chapter 2. The speaker is highly emotional as if he wants to pick a fight with the addressee.

In all the examples in (11), (12) and (13), the speaker’s main concern is to overtly not acknowledge the relative social status between him/herself and the addressee who is a minister or the prime minister. In each case the speakers attempt to disqualify, criticise or scorn the addressee. The use of anata serves to express the speaker’s attitude of explicitly ignoring or rejecting the given status relationship.

By looking at these examples, one realises immediately that the utterances in the above examples are highly aggressive and disrespectful. It is helpful here to touch on the notion of impoliteness. I use the term ‘impoliteness’ rather than ‘rudeness’, following Culpeper’s (2005) notion of impoliteness. The next section will discuss this.

7.6.2. Impoliteness, power and the use of anata

Culpeper (2005) suggests that ‘rudeness’ and ‘impoliteness’ are to be distinguished in terms of intentionality. According to Culpeper (2005: 63), the term ‘rudeness’ is to be used for an offence which is unintentionally caused, while ‘impoliteness’ is to be used for cases where the offence is intentionally caused. Culpeper (2008: 32) states that impoliteness would be a suitable term for an “intentional face-attack”. Further, Culpeper (2008: 33ff) points out the importance of recognising the relationship between power and impoliteness.

Brown and Levinson (1987: 77 [1978]) note the “asymmetric social dimension of relative power” and “the degree to which H can impose his own plans and self-evaluation (face) at the expense of S’s plans and self-evaluation”. Brown and Gilman (1960: 55) also discuss power as follows.
One person may be said to have power over another in the degree that he is able to control the behaviour of the other. Power is a relationship between at least two persons, and it is nonreciprocal in the sense that both cannot have power in the same area of behavior.

(Brown and Gilman, 1960: 255)

Based on a fundamental asymmetry in a relationship, Culpeper (1996: 354) argues that:

A powerful participant has more freedom to be impolite, because he or she can (a) reduce the ability of the less powerful participant to retaliate with impoliteness (e.g. through the denial of speaking rights), and (b) threaten more severe retaliation should the less powerful participant be impolite.

(Culpeper, 1996: 354)

Culpeper (2008) describes the example of army recruit training where face-attacking discourse is central. In this context, an army sergeant is allowed to be impolite to a recruit but not vice versa. He states that impoliteness is “more likely” to “occur in situations where there is an imbalance of social structural power” and “the powerful participants not only do impoliteness but are supported by the social structure in doing so” (Culpeper, 2008: 39).

On the other hand, Diamond (1996: 9) points out that “institutionalized status alone does not account for the relative power and political effectiveness of the members”. Locher (2004: 31) also points out the necessity to differentiate power from status and notes that “[s]tatus is hence not seen as synonymous to power, but as its seat”. Locher (2004: 37) further states that “power is regarded as relational, dynamic and contestable” and “interactants with lower status can decide to exercise power over people with
relatively greater status” (Locher, 2004: 31). Culpeper (2008: 37) also recognises this point and uses the army recruit’s example again.

“If an army sergeant is impolite to a recruit and then that recruit responds with impoliteness, that recruit’s impoliteness not only restricts the sergeant’s action-environment (just as the sergeant had done to the recruit), but also challenges the (largely institutional) power sustaining an asymmetrical relationship.

(Culpeper, 2008: 37)

What is relevant to our analysis of the MPs utterances with the use of anata in the above discussion of power and impoliteness is the aspect of power being dynamic and contestable. A striking fact in the data from the minutes of the Japanese Diet is that among the deictic uses of anata classified into the function of rejecting a given social relationship, 97% are observed in an inferior speakers’ utterances towards a superior addressee such as a minister or the prime minister. In other words, the occurrence of the use of anata in parliamentary debate clearly indicates the speaker’s challenge to the greater power possessed by the addressee. In fact, in the prime minister’s utterances towards ordinary MPs, there is no occurrence of the use of anata which can be categorised into this function.

This tendency in parliamentary debate displays a sharp contrast with native speakers’ self-reports (cf. Chapter 4). In the survey, 93.6% of the respondents answered that they would never use anata towards a socially superior addressee. Only a very small number of respondents reported that they may use anata towards a superior when they attack or criticise the superior addressee. Attacking and criticising a superior is an ‘unusual’ situation in everyday conversation. However, such situations are on parade in parliamentary debates.
Enfield (2011: 293) uses the words “entitlement (what we may do)”, “responsibilities (what we must do)” and “enablements (things one can do)” when analysing the concept of status. He states that “[t]he measure of enablement is the degree to which one is capable of carrying it out at all” (ibid). According to Enfield (2011: 293), there are cases of mismatch between entitlement and enablement. It is the gap between an individual’s claim based on his/her ‘official’ authority and the demonstration of his/her ‘actual’ authority. To show enablement, one must “produce an assemblage of performances that would not be possible were the claim not true” (ibid). Enfield (2011: 294) further states as follows, regarding the importance of demonstration.

It appears that in the business of maintaining statuses - a desperate pursuit that dominates our social lives - it is not enough merely to possess enablements and entitlements. One must exercise these as a way of demonstrating that one has them (and has earned them), both by proving with action that one is capable of carrying them out [...] and by showing that, having carried them out.

(Enfield, 2011: 294)

The nature of parliamentary debate is fundamentally a power negotiation. In particular, an authority with greater power is constantly evaluated, resisted and challenged. When possessors of official power such as the prime minister do not demonstrate their responsibilities, they are accused of not having enablements. As we have seen in Section 7.6.1, in examples (11), the speakers attempt to disqualify the possessors of ‘official’ authority. Examples (12) try to depict how incapable the power holders are, and the examples in (13) show the speaker’s derision. These examples demonstrate the speakers’ ‘intentional face-attack’ or ‘face aggravation’ in their challenge to official power. Here, the use of anata occurs as a tool of power negotiation. That is to say, by not indicating
their asymmetrical relative positions but explicitly expressing non-acknowledgement of them with the use of *anata*, the speaker can demonstrate rejection of the official authority. With the use of *anata*, which absolutely specifies the second person, the speakers deliver messages such as ‘I do not call you minister/prime minister’ because ‘you are not entitled’ and hence ‘I do not accept you as a minister/prime minister’.

### 7.7. Summary

This chapter has analysed the use of *anata* in a parliamentary debate. I have attested that the functions of the use of *anata* discussed in the Chapters 5 and 6 also hold true in the parliamentary setting. I also showed that the nature of this particular genre of conversational interaction makes for rich soil for the occurrence of *anata*.

In socially undefinable relationships, *anata* is observed in cases where the speaker uses a form of reported speech and where the speaker refers to an unfamiliar addressee. In the former case, the speaker uses *anata* to refer to a general audience, a non-specific individual or a collective entity in reported speech. This is one of an MP’s speech techniques used when he/she describes certain documents, experienced events, assumed situations and discussions with other parties. *Anata’s* property of absolute specification makes it possible to refer to the addressee as a general audience, a nameless someone or ‘the other party’ in described situations. When *anata* is used deictically (i.e. not in reported speech) in a socially undefinable situation, it is used to refer to an unfamiliar addressee in a witness summoning event. *Anata’s* power of absolute specification of the second person again serves to refer to the witness as a mere individual addressee without displaying any of his/her social elements.
When *anata* is used in socially definable relationships such as between an ordinary MP and the prime minister, the speaker’s use of *anata* serves to make explicit the speaker’s non-acknowledgement of the given relative social positions between the interlocutors. The use of *anata* here is a vigorous tool for rejecting the given official authority and power. Among the various functions of the use of *anata*, that of rejecting a given relationship is by far the most commonly and prominently observed in parliamentary debate. Parliamentary debate is a place of confrontation, intentional face-attack, and negotiation of power. Thus, contrary to the general notion that *anata* should not be used towards a superior addressee, it is a place where an inferior speaker commonly uses *anata* towards a superior addressee as a vehicle for contesting, resisting, denying and struggling for official authority and power.

From the previous studies, there is a view that the use of *anata* occurs in ‘formal’ or ‘official’ settings (Kanamaru, 1997). Parliament debate is indeed a formal and official setting. However, by closely investigating the functions of the use of *anata* in parliamentary debates in this chapter, it is now clear that formality is not the reason for the occurrence of *anata* in parliament. The notion of absolute specification systematically explains why we tend to observe the use of *anata* in this genre of verbal interaction.
Chapter 8

Ideology, identity, reflexive processes and the use of *anata*

8.1. Introduction

Throughout Chapters 5, 6 and 7, I consistently showed that the core property of *anata* is absolute specification of the second person entity without displaying the interlocutors’ social elements.

The socially inert nature of *anata* was intuited at one time by language policy makers during the post war egalitarian trend. In 1952, *anata* was defined as a ‘standard’ address term in a new language policy proposal. It was regarded as suitable for use towards any addressee in a new democratic society, just like the English ‘you’. However, while its use was nationally encouraged, it has never been widely accepted in the way it was proposed. As we have seen in Chapter 4, present-day native speakers of Japanese report that they rarely use *anata* as a regular address term. I have also shown in Chapters 5 to 7 that *anata* tends to occur in limited contexts, far from being used as a ‘standard’ second person pronoun.

In this chapter, I explore public debates about the notion of the ‘standard’ address term *anata* that occurred after the policy proposal was released. The debates show that native speakers’ perceptions of the word were typically generated from individuals’ reflexive processes in their own local interactions which were connected to their identity
within their different social positions. Further, these reflexive processes were inevitably implicated in the highly ideological process of Japan’s modernisation.

This chapter is organised as follows. In section 8.2, I discuss the language policy proposal released in 1952, in which *anata* was defined as a ‘standard’ address term, and I also discuss the egalitarian ideology attached to the address term. Section 8.3 examines the later public debates which occurred through the media and which focused intensively on the use of *anata*. I examine users’ reflexive processes in shaping their perceptions towards the term. In section 8.4, I deal with a remaining case, which is the case of a wife’s use of *anata* towards her husband. I have left the analysis of this particular case until now, treating it as a special usage. In the previous literature, this usage has been regarded as archaic and has often been excluded from analysis. In Section 8.4, I suggest potential reflexive processes which explain why this particular usage has come to be deemed as it is today. Section 8.5 is a summary.

8.2. Language policy, egalitarianism and the use of *anata*

*Anata*’s property of the absolute specification of the second person without displaying the interlocutor’s relative social status was intuited at one time by Japanese language policy makers. Due to its socially inert nature, *anata* was defined by the policy makers as a ‘standard’ address term, suitable for use towards any addressee regardless of their social status. The proposal of the national language policy was titled *Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorifics For The Future’ 48 and was issued by *Kokugo Shingikai* ‘the National Language Council’.

---

48 The English translations of the title ‘Honorifics For The Future’ is from Inoue (2006). The translation of the texts extracted from the policy proposal and other materials are all my own.
Kokugo Shingikai was established in 1934 as an advisory body to the Ministry of Education and since then it has been significantly influential in Japanese language policy and education. Its work includes creating regulations related to Chinese characters in common use and the use of kana, as well as the use of honorifics (Seki, 1997). During World War II, Kokugo Shingikai was under the control of the military authorities but after the war, its policies were influenced by GHQ (General Headquarters/ Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers) (Yasuda, 2007).

Under the proposal, the system of honorifics, which was once said to be the expression of kyoukei no seishin ‘spirit of respect and humbleness’ that centred on the kooshitsu ‘Imperial Household’ and shison ni taishi tatematsu to onore o munashiusuru kokoro ‘spirit of emptying self and serving the Emperor’ (The Ministry of Education, 1937), had now become a hookenteki isei ‘feudalistic relic’ (Tanaka, 1989: 18). The preface of the proposal emphasised a ‘new system’ of honorifics as an element of the ‘new ways’ of a ‘new life’ in a ‘new era’.51

49 In 2001, it became a subcommittee of the Council for Cultural Affairs under the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.
50 Kakugi kettei ‘cabinet decision’ in 1942 states: Nihongo kyooiku narabini nihongo fukyuu ni kansuru shooho sakaru wa rikukaigun no yookyuu ni yoozyuu ni motozuki, monbushoo ni oite kore o kikaku ritsuan suru koto. ‘Policies regarding Japanese language education and dissemination of Japanese language must be based on requirements from the military, and planned and drafted by the Ministry of Education’ (Cabinet decision 18/08/1942, cited in Seki (1997))
51 In 1946, the Emperor declared that he was not divine but a human in Tennoo Ningen Sengen ‘Humanity Declaration’ stating: Chin to nanjira kokumin tono aida no juutai wa shuushi soogo no shinrai to keita to ni yorite musubare, tannaru shinwa to densetsu to ni yorite shozeru mono ni arazu. Tennoo o motte akitsumikami to shi, katsu nihonkokumin o motte hoka no minzoku ni yuuetsu seru minzoku ni shite, hiite sekai o shii kehaku unmei o yuuzyuu to kakuunaru kannen ni motozuku mono nimo arazu. ‘The ties between Us and Our people have always stood upon mutual trust and affection. They do not depend upon mere legends and myths. They are not predicated on the false conception that the Emperor is divine, and that the Japanese people are superior to other races and fated to rule the world.’ (Shin Nippon Kensetsu ni Kansuru Shoosho ‘Imperial Rescript on the Construction of A New Japan’, 01/01/1946)
Ganrai, keigo no mondai wa tannaru kotoba no ue dake no mondai denaku, jisseikatsu ni okeru sahoo to ittai o nasu mono dearu kara, korekara no keigo wa, korekara no atarashii jidai no seikatsu ni sokushta atarashii sahoo no seichoo to tomoni, heimei kansona atarashii keigohoo toshite, kenzenna hattatsu o togeru koto o nozomu shidai dearu.

‘Primarily, the issue of honorifics is not only on the surface of language matters but inseparable from real life. Thus, we aim that honorifics from now on will be based on our new ways in a new life in the new era and develop them as a new system that is plain and simple.’

(Korekara no Keigo ‘Honorifics For The Future’, 1952)

In the ‘new era’, the target was the ‘plain and simple’ use of language. The basic principles goes on to state:

Koremade no keigo wa, kyuujidai ni hattatsushita mamade, hitsuyoo ijoo ni hanzatsuna ten ga atta. Korekara no keigo wa, sono ikitugi o imashime, goyoo o tadashi, dekirudake heimei kanso ni aritai mono dearu.

‘Honorifics in the past were left from what was developed in an old era and were excessively complex. Honorifics from now on aim to fix aspects that have gone too far as well as our misuses. It is desirable that (honorifics for the future) be plain and simple.’

Koremade no keigo wa, shutoshite joogekankei ni tatte hattatsushitekita ga, korekara no keigo wa, kakujin no kihonteki jinkaku o sonchoosuru soogo sonkei no ue ni tatanakereba naranai.

‘Honorifics in the past developed mainly based on vertical relationships. However, honorifics from now on must be based on a mutual respect that values individuals’ basic personalities.’

(Korekara no Keigo ‘Honorifics For The Future’, 1952)
As we can see, these principles attempt to assist the deconstruction of the previous strong focus on asymmetry in vertical relationships which made the use of honorifics excessively complex.

Here, it is important to note that the proposal attempted to present the abandonment of vertically oriented honorifics usage and the move forward to a new era of egalitarian language use as simply a movement along the linear axis of time ‘from the past to the future’. In fact, this move was based on a combination of reactions to Japan’s loss at war and so-called ‘mother tongue pessimism’ (Tanaka, 1989; Hatta, 2003).

During Japan’s aggression and colonisation in Asia and the Pacific during its period of modernisation, there was advocacy for *Tooago toshite no nihongo* ‘Japanese as a Greater East Asian language’ and *Daitooa kyooeiken no kooyoogo toshite no nihongo* ‘Japanese as an official language in the Greater East Asian Region’ (Seki, 1997: 39). However, Japanese language educators who were sent to the field faced the reality of the difficulties of teaching Japanese to those the national authority called

---

52 The preface of *Daitoowa Kyooeiken to Kokugoseisaku* ‘The Greater East Asian Region and National Language Policy’ says: *Daitoaa sensoo kaishi irai, koogun no kakukakutaru ichidai senka niyori, imaya daitooa kyooeiken no kakuritsu o mi, wagakuni ga sono meishu toshite kyooeiken o zendoi subeki juudai naru sekimu o ninau ni itatta no dearu. Shikaraba, kongo wagakuni no kore ni shosubeki ikuta juudainaru mondai no shoozuru koto mo mata, toozen no jishoo dearu. Shikashite, sono hitotsu wa kokugo seisaku dearu koto mo bannin no hitoshiku mitomeru tokoro dearoo. Somosomo kyooeiken nai no kakuminzoku o yoku itchi danketsu seshime, tagaini ai yuuya shite, sono hatten ni doryoku seshimeru niwa, waga nihongo o kennai no tsuuuyoogo to suru koto ga naniyorimo juuyouonaru jooken dearu koto wa gen o matanu tokoro dearu.*

Since The Great East Asia War, by the Imperial Army’s brilliant and great war results, we see the establishment of The Greater East Asian Region. An important time has arrived in that our nation must take responsibility for guiding the region properly as a leader of the confederation. Thus, it is natural for our nation to deal with significant issues. All of us agree with that one of these issues is the national language policy. First of all, it is needless to say that to get each ethnic group to unite, harmonise and make an effort for development, it is most important to make Japanese language as an official language of the region. (*Daitooa Kyooeiken to Kokugo Seisaku*, 1942, cited from Seki (1997: 40))
**seifukusha** ‘the conquered’ in a short time span (Tanaka, 1989: 11). The fact that Japanese has a rather complex writing system which consists of *hiragana*, *katakana* and *kanji* ‘Chinese characters’ and an intricate honorifics system made the then language educators in the field believe that such a language would not easily be acquired in a short time (Tanaka, 1989). As is well known, honorifics in Japanese are a system built traditionally with the Emperor being at its top. It is ironic that the Emperor’s power and Japan as an ‘Imperial Army’ were emphasised during wartime and hence the proper use of honorifics was highly important, but at the same time, the most difficult aspect for language educators in the field to teach was the very system of honorifics.

The ‘difficulty’ of acquiring Japanese was combined with another belief among some scholars that Japanese was an ‘inferior’ language. Japanese was known as an isolated language without having a clear language family, and this was said to be a disadvantage among some intellectuals (Tanaka, 1989). The chairman of *Kokugo Shingikai*, Koichi Hoshina, who made the official remarks about language policy in The Greater East Asian Region in 1942 was also heard making ‘unofficial’ comments. He was witnessed talking about Japanese as *tane sonomon ga warui* ‘the species itself is inferior’ under cover of the official comments (Tanaka, 1989: 14). Along with Hoshina, some scholars and authorities held the idea that Japanese was a ‘backward language’ and needed to ‘reform’. The folklorist Kunio Yanagida remarked that if Japanese used only Romanisation or Kana script, it would be an easy language, although he admitted that such a practice would ignore important aspects of Japanese language (Tanaka, 1989: 12). Arinori Mori, who was the first Minister of Education, radically advocated the idea that Japan should use English as an official language to aid modernisation. Mori’s idea was taken up by some post war authorities such as Ozaki Yukio, who became a politician.
after working as a journalist. Both Mori and Ozaki explicitly expressed the idea that Japanese was an inferior language and that English was a language of civilisation (Hatta, 2003). These views have been named ‘mother tongue pessimism’ (Tanaka, 1989; Hatta, 2003).

‘Mother tongue pessimism’ was a train of thought whereby Japanese language practice was brought into “invidious (self-critical) comparison with the (undifferentiated) West” (Inoue, 2006: 82). Any differences between Japanese and Western languages were “perceived by Japanese intellectuals as a lack, defect, or form of backwardness” (Inoue, 2006: 82). This coincided with and was reinforced by Japan’s loss in World War II, so that a variety of factors and beliefs reinforced the idea that the current Japanese language did not suit a modern country and needed to be reformed (Tanaka, 1989). We can see traces here of the idea that the proposed language modernisation was “a linguistic consciousness intimately connected with the exercise of modern forms of power” (Inoue, 2006: 82).

Indeed, the language proposal can be seen as part of the history of internalising Japan’s narrative of its modernisation, stated by Inoue (2006: 166) as follows.

Japan as an industrialized, modern nation has relied ideologically on a linear and progressivist narrative of its own history “from feudalism to modernity,” and this inexorably entails a profound temporal bifurcation between the past and the present, often understood as a contrast between tradition and modernity.

(Inoue, 2006: 166)

This bifurcation between the past and the present is clearly observed in the language policy proposal shown earlier.
In this context, *Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorifics For The Future’ by Kokugo Shingikai ‘the National Language Council’ targeted the use of address terms for change because their use reflected the complex vertical relationships in Japanese society. In the proposal, *anata* was treated as a ‘standard’ form of second person reference term. An extract is provided below.

*Aite o sasu kotoba*
‘Terms of address’:

(i) *Anata o hyoojun no katachi to suru.*
‘*Anata* is the standard form’.

(ii) *Tegami (kooshi tomo) no yoogo to shite, koremade ‘kiden’ ‘kika’ nado o tsukatteiru no mo, korekara wa ‘anata’ de tsuuyoo suru yooni aritai.*
‘As for terms for letters (both private and public), *kiden* ‘you (honorific)’ *kika* ‘you (honorific)’ and so forth should gradually be replaced with the use of *anata*’.

(iii) ‘*Kimi’ ‘boku’ wa, iwayuru ‘kimi/boku’ no shitashii aidagara dake no yoogo to shite, ippan niwa, hyoojun no katachi dearu ‘watashi/anata’ o tsukaitai. Shitagatte ‘ore’ ‘omae’ mo, shidaini ‘watashi/anata’ o tsukau yooni shitai. ‘*Kimi* ‘you (informal)’ *boku* ‘I (male, informal)’ should be used only in a close relationship and it is desirable to use *watashi* ‘I’ / *anata* ‘you’ generally. Thus, *ore* ‘I (male, vulgar)’ *omae* ‘you (vulgar)’ should also be replaced with *watashi/anata*.’

*(Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorifics For The Future’, 1952)*

The section on the use of personal reference terms suggests abolishing the very polite expressions, as well as restraining the use of informal and vulgar forms. The
reciprocal use of *watashi/anata* between individuals was encouraged. Understandably, there was a view that the reciprocal use of *watashi/anata* was apparently influenced by the English ‘I’ and ‘you’.

The doctrine of the egalitarian use of *anata* was welcomed by a group of *chishikijin* ‘intellectuals’, as seen in the following statement by Kindaichi, a famous leading scholar of Japanese linguistics.

> Korekara no daimeishi wa, kono hookoo e iku no dewa arumai ka. Fuufu no aida bakari denaku, shokuba demo, mata jookan to kanryoo demo, koomuin to minkanjin to no aida demo, ichiyooni, tagaini ‘watashi’ ‘anata’ de motte, choodo eigo no ‘I’ ‘you’ no yooni, ittara, minshushugi no daimeishi ga hakkiri seiritsusuru no dewa arumai ka.

> ‘Pronouns from now on will probably go in such a direction. Not only between a couple, but also in the workplace, between a superior and an inferior, and between a public servant and a citizen, if we use ‘*watashi*’ and ‘*anata*’ consistently like the English ‘I’ and ‘you’, I think a democratic pronoun system will be established.’

(Kindaichi, 1959: 163)

This is the view that *anata* is the second person pronoun of the future, as a symbol of modernisation, democracy and egalitarianism.

In fact, across languages, the connection between the use of address terms and certain ideological values is not a new concept. For example, in languages such as English and French, the notion of ‘plain you’ has at times been connected to an index of egalitarianism and a deconstruction of traditional asymmetrical relationships. Here, I

---

53 This view is expressed by a native speaker in a comment in a newspaper column (Yomiuri Shimbun, 15/10/1976) which can be found in Section 8.3.2.
briefly summarise parts of the stories of English and French because they are relevant to an understanding of how address terms become a focal point of ideological struggles.

English second person pronouns have a specific social history that influenced the disappearance of the second person singular category in combination with “the shaping influence of ideological struggle” (Silverstein, 1985: 244). In English, *thou/thee* vs. *ye/you* was once simply a referential singular/plural distinction. However, under the Anglo-Norman French influence in the thirteenth century, usages of so-called polite and familiar second person pronouns were adopted by educated English speakers (Silverstein, 1985).

As is well known, Brown and Gilman (1960) have discussed *T-V* forms in European languages such as French, Italian and Spanish. *T-V* forms originated from Latin pronouns of address, that is, the singular *tu* and plural *vos*. The use of plural forms to refer to a singular power figure later created what Brown and Gilman called “the nonreciprocal power semantic” (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 255). That is to say, a superior refers to an inferior with a familiar *T*-form and receives a polite *V*-form. The inferior refers to the superior with the *V*-form and receives the *T*-form. Further, one refers to a solidary addressee with *T*, and to a non-solidary addressee with *V*. In Brown and Gilman’s terms, these features are the semantics of ‘power and solidarity’.

The Anglo-Norman French influence led English to gain the semantics of power and solidarity in *thou/you* forms. One refers to a superior addressee with *Y* and to an inferior addressee with *T*, as well as referring to a solidary addressee with *T*, and to a non-solidary addressee with *Y*. The signal of speaking to a superior is that of speaking

---

54 “In Italian, they became *tu* and *voi* (with *Lei* eventually largely displacing *voi*); in French *tu* and *vous*; in Spanish *tu* and *vos* (later *usted*)” (Brown and Gilman, 1960: 254).
non-intimately. Gradually, upper class or ‘well-bred’ persons came to use the mutual You towards each other as an index of their status and cultivation (Silverstein, 1985).

However, this trend was opposed by some groups of people, especially the religious group ‘the Friends’ (the so-called Quakers) (Silverstein, 1985). The Friends promoted the notion of individualism that radically placed all men equally before God and they attacked the pronominal usage of You in the aforementioned indexical values. For this reason, mid-century Quakers came to use T exclusively as a second person singular form and never used You. This usage of T was socially shocking and regarded as insulting by both religious and civil authorities. What happened next in English is described by Silverstein as follows.

Friends use symmetric T, and hence others had to avoid it, lest they be mistaken for members of the sect; Friends avoid symmetric You, and hence others must use it only. Consequently, a new system emerges, in which societal norms abandon T decisively as a usage indexing speaker as Quaker and take up the invariant usage of You. A STRUCTURAL or FORMAL change in the norms of English has been effected.

(Silverstein, 1985: 250-251)

In English, ideological struggle within society forced a formal change whereby the use of the second person pronoun thou eventually disappeared from Modern English.

In the case of French, it has also been reported that the use of ‘generalised tu’ was encouraged during the French Revolution under an egalitarian ideology, although it was not successful (Morford, 1997). Interestingly, a ‘generalised tu’ movement is being depicted again in contemporary French society. Morford (1997: 4) explains that the

---

55 For the details of the history of thou’s disappearance in English, see Silverstein (1985).
notion of French society’s move towards a ‘generalised tu’ is a “popular formula” related to two shifts in patterns of pronominal address. First, French native speakers sense that the use of tu in both private and public contexts has become “broader” and “less explicitly restricted” than in the past, especially among elites and those who are eager to be a part of them. Second, the notion also indicates a native speakers’ sense that asymmetrical tu/vous usages have become less common, which means that pronominal address has “become less explicitly oriented towards marking differences in social status.” Morford (1997) further states as follows:

Indeed, these shifts in patterns of pronominal address are commonly invoked as crucial signs of a broader transformation of standards of civility that has occurred in tandem with the post-war ‘modernization’ of French society. Norms of behavior associated with the prominence of ‘traditional’ elites are seen to have given way to seemingly more casual and less status-conscious modes of conduct, to an informal and egalitarian style of interaction known as ‘la decontraction’.

(Morford, 1997: 4)

However, most importantly, Morford (1997: 4) emphasises that “contemporary patterns of address and the longer-term historical evolution of such patterns are more complex than popular notions about the ‘generalisation of tu’ suggest.” From extensive interviews with native French speakers and consultation of various materials, Morford (1997) reveals that contrary to the popular notion that French society is moving towards a generalised use of tu, the use of vous in both symmetrical and asymmetrical interactions is far from being extinguished. On this point, Morford (1997: 31) captures complex layers of the use of the T-V system in contemporary French. She argues that the wider use of tu and the tendency of preference for symmetrical use of address terms
do not suggest that social differences and barriers have become irrelevant. Speakers convey differences of identity, status and personal disposition through the $T-V$ system, although it may be more subtle than before.$^{56}$

As seen in the above examples in English and French, address pronouns can become a focal point for expressing interpretations and applications of certain ideological values. We can see that there is an analogy of logic across these languages and Japanese whereby certain address pronouns are connected to an egalitarian ideology. That said, the process of change in address pronoun usages in a given language in a cultural context is unique to a given society at a given time.

In the case of Japanese, the suggested ‘egalitarian’ use of $anata$ came via a top-down mode of language policy proposal as part of Japan’s post-war modernisation but it was not straightforwardly accepted by language users in local communications. After the publication of the proposal $Korekara no Keigo$, which was widely exposed to society through the media, public debates occurred about whether native speakers agreed or disagreed with the proposal, as well as how they fundamentally regarded the address pronoun $anata$. These debates exhibited divided views, which I will show in the next section.

$^{56}$ Morford goes on to state “[a]ware, too, of the different sorts of qualities — refinement, status, political orientation, vitality, and so forth — that they can signal about themselves through their use of this system, they also experience sometimes contradictory desires to embody these differing values: to be at once professionally competent (i.e., maintaining symmetrical $vous$ with their colleagues) and “young at heart” (readily switching to symmetrical $tu$), distinguished (inclined to say $vous$), and liberal (disposed to say $tu$). In other words, their acute awareness of these multiple effects and overlapping values suggests that at least for some time to come, $vous$, like $tu$, will continue to be, just as etiquette guide author Laure Verly once described it, “a resource of the French language that it is still good to use” (Morford, 1997: 31-32).
8.3. Public debates about the use of *anata*

A decade after the release of the proposal *Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorifics For The Future’ by *Kokugo Shingikai* ‘the National Language Council’, large scale debates among native speakers about the use of *anata* had started to occur. They were large scale in the sense that the debates were constantly exposed nationwide through mass media, in this case, major newspapers. The debates appear to present the different ideologies, identities and values of native speakers. Some align with the policy while others express an intuitive feeling of incongruence about the use of *anata*. At a glance, it displays a binary argument between egalitarians vs. norm upholders. However, a variety of episodes and readers’ opinions reveal how one’s interpretation of the term is created through discursive reflexive processes.

To understand this, I draw upon the notion of what Agha (2007) calls ‘reflexive processes’. The following sub-sections start by briefly touching on this notion (in Section 8.3.1). I then discuss the dichotomy between the views of egalitarians and norm upholders in terms of their preferred language use in Section 8.3.2. Also in Section 8.3.3, I show that existing power boundaries in combination with socio-cultural norms made the impossibility of egalitarian use of *anata* rather obvious.

---

57 Although some articles can be found from the 1950s in which readers made comments about the use of *anata*, larger debates started to happen from the 1960s. One of the largest-scale treatments of the use of *anata* was a daily column on Japanese language called *Nihongo no genba* ‘Scenes of Japanese Language’ in the Yomiuri newspaper, the most widely read Japanese newspaper. Yomiuri published a series of reports and discussions about the use of *anata* in the 1970s. The column focused solely on the use of *anata* as its centre of discussion during October and November 1976. Extracted comments in this chapter are mainly from around this time.
8.3.1. Reflexive processes

Agha’s (2007) notion of reflexive uses of language is important for our subsequent discussion.

Whether we are dealing with stereotypic or emergent social effects, or with the way in which they are laminated together in some stretch of semiotic activity, our ability to describe such effects depends on reflexive uses of language. Such uses of language are reflexive in the sense that language is both a semiotic mechanism involved in the performance of these effects and in their construal.

(Agha, 2007: 16)

Agha (2007: 190) further states that reflexive processes are “processes of value production, maintenance and transformation” including language users’ metalinguistic activities, which are “a vast range of meaningful behaviors that typify the attributes of language, its users, and the activities accomplished through its use” (Agha, 2007: 17).

My analysis of the public debates about the use of anata is in line with this view, treating the debates as metalinguistic activities. An examination of these debates reveals the complexity of interpretations made by language users. Further, the fact that these debates were read in the public sphere of the print media nationwide means that readers’ reflexive processes would have contributed to individuals’ value constructions and hence their interpretations of the use of anata.

Regarding the existence of variations of interpretations, Agha further comments as follows.

There is no necessity, of course, that such evaluations always be consistent with each other society-internally; in fact their mutual inconsistency often provides
crucial evidence for the co-existence of distinct, socially positioned ideologies of language within a language community.

(Agha, 2007: 202)

Indeed, in the case of the current discussion, language users’ interpretations and evaluations of the use of *anata* are inconsistent. In the next subsections, I will demonstrate this inconsistency which ultimately serves to increase our understanding of the formation of perceptions about the term *anata*.

### 8.3.2. Emerging egalitarians vs. norm upholders

The public debates examined for this study were mainly drawn from two major Japanese newspapers, the *Asahi Shimbun* and *Yomiuri Shimbun* between the 1960s and 1980s, as well as some episodes related to the debates in the previous literature. The debates regarding the use of *anata* among native speakers display a form of dichotomy between ideologically motivated speakers’ egalitarian use of *anata*, which matched a trend in the new society, and the norm up-holders’ discomfort with its use.

From the former, the rationale for the use of the ‘standard’ address term *anata* to any addressee was a form of social progress: as a means to diminish an allegedly excessive emphasis on vertical relationships. The *Yomiuri Shimbun* (15/10/1976) introduced the playwright Naoya Uchida’s view that *anata* was *sairyoo no nininshoo* ‘the best second person reference term’.

*Moshi, nanae o ‘san’ zuke de yobu koto mo dekinai shi, ‘sensei’ tomo ‘okusan’ tomo, aruiwa ‘kachoo’ toitta yakushoku demo yobenai baai, nan to yobeba ii n desu ka. Nihongo no naka ni ‘anata’ igai tektouo nininshoo daimeishi ga nai no dakara, ‘anata’ o joozuni tsukaikonashite iku shika nai n janai deshoo ka.*
‘If (we) cannot refer to someone using a name with *san* (polite suffix, inclusive ‘Mr. Mrs. Miss. Ms’), *sensei* ‘teacher’, *okusan* ‘Madam/Mrs. (lit. wife)’ or position titles such as *kachoo* ‘section manager’, how do we call (him/her)? In Japanese, there is no appropriate word except for *anata*. So, handling *anata* well is the only way (in this new society).’

(Yomiuri Shimbun, 15/10/1976)

In this comment, Uchida intuitively construed *anata* as a term which does not index the social relationship between interlocutors. In the same interview, he also commented that Japanese people should become ‘freer’ and the use of the ‘basic’ form *anata* towards any addressee should be welcomed, rather than restricting its use towards a superior. Uchida also actively appeared on TV programs and enthusiastically advocated the use of *anata* towards any addressees (Araki, 1990).

Another supporter of the proposal, the linguist Miwa58 (2010: 161), recollected how he actually practised the standard use of *anata* in his university classes around that time.

*Nihongo de no taitoona kaiwa, taiwa, giron no kanoosei o saguttekita. Kyooshitsu no naka de no kaiwa mo dekirudake taitoona kotobazukai o kokorogaketa. Sono baai jishooshi wa ‘watashi’ o, taishooshi wa danshigakusei ni mo joshigakusei ni mo ‘anata’ o tsukatta. Shoowa 27nen no ‘Korekara no keigo’ ni kyooken shita kara dearu. [...] Katee na keigo o sake, dekirudake kantan meiryoono keigo o kokorogaketa.

‘I had been searching for possibilities of ways of conversation, dialogue and discussion on an equal footing (between interlocutors). In my classroom, I tried equal verbal communication. There, I used *watashi* for first person and *anata* for

---

58 Miwa (2010) now holds the view that *anata* entails an impolite nuance as seen in Chapter 2. He used to advocate the egalitarian use of *anata* in line with the policy proposal but realised it was not straightforward given the norms of Japanese communication.
second person consistently towards both male and female students. This is because I supported the concepts of Korekara no Keigo in 1952. [...] Also, I aimed to use plain and clear honorifics as much as I could.’

(Miwa, 2010: 161)

Miwa regarded the ‘standard’ use of anata as something that he was waiting for in order to practise conversation on an equal footing. By doing this in his university classes, he apparently attempted to play the role of an advocate as well as an actual practitioner of the policy. This is also a facet of his professional identity, whereby he trusts in and aims his linguistic practices at achieving an equal footing.

The notion of anata as a standard form of address became congruent also with a movement based around women’s expression of identity. A female reader sent a letter to the Asahi Shimbun reflecting the following view.

Watashi wa ~~san no okusan to yobareru no ga sukidenai. Hakkiri ieba kirai da. Otto no shokugyoo ya chii ni yotte yobina ga kawattari, tonari no okusan to yobareru yori wa, Matsumoto Aya san toiu kojin to tsukiaatte hoshii kara da. Doose nara kekkon shitemo, watashi no rekishi o seotta Murakami Aya san toiu kyuusei de itai gurai da. Sonna omoi ga ‘anata’ to deru no daga, yahari yobareta hito wa shitsurei da to kanjiru no deshoo ka. Watashi wa aite o kojin toshite mitome, doosei toshite sonkei shiteiru kara koso, to omou no desu ga......

‘I don’t like being called Mr. ~~’s wife. To be honest, I hate it. Rather than changing address terms depending on one’s husband’s occupation and position or being referred to as Madam next-door, I want to be interacted with as an individual Aya Matsumoto. I would even like to keep my maiden name Aya Murakami which carries my life history. Such feelings lead me to use anata, but would the addressee feel that it’s rude? I use it only because I regard and respect the addressee as an individual woman.’

(Asahi Shimbun, 27/09/1983)
In this comment, she expresses her desire to be an individual without being labelled by social roles. We have seen in the previous chapters that the property of *anata*, that is, the absolute specification of the second person, functions to reject a given expected social relationship. This function was intuited here to express this woman’s identity as an independent individual. It functions to reject the practice of referring to women by their domestic social positions such as ‘someone’s wife’, whose identity depends on her husband, or merely as the ‘lady next-door’.

This woman’s letter reminds us of the concept stated by Lakoff (1973) that “[s]ociologically it is probably fairly obvious that a woman in most subcultures in our society achieves status only through her father’s, husband’s, or lover’s position” (Lakoff, 1973b: 62). The flow of feminism, mainly from the U.S., was already known to Japan in the 60’s (Reynolds, 1997). Women’s *hontoo no jibun o yonde hoshii* ‘desire to be referred to as her true self’ (Takasaki, 1992: 115), not as a daughter, a wife or a mother was expressed in various genres such as poems and novels. For example, the following poem *Watashi o tabanenaide* ‘Don’t bundle me’ was written by the female poet Kazue Shinkawa in 1966.59

```
Watashi o nazukenaide
Musume to iu na  Tsuma to iu na
Ooomoshii haha to iu na de shitsuraeta za ni
Suwarikiri ni sasenaide kudasai Watashi wa kaze
Ring no ki to
Izumi no arika o shitteiru kaze
Don’t name me
A name like ‘daughter’ A name like ‘wife’
```

---

59 The poem consists of five parts and the extract is the fourth part.
A seat equipped with a weighty name ‘mother’
Please don’t keep me sitting there, I am a wind
A wind who knows where apple trees are
and where a fountain is

(Kazue Shinkawa, 1966)

Thus, for some, the notion of the ‘egalitarian use of anata’ was timely in that their different layers of identity expression matched this notion. Their perceptions and opinions reflected the view of modernity that subsumes democracy, deconstruction of hierarchy and gender equality.

However, for others, the use of anata as an expression of egalitarianism was not congruent with their preferred language use. To the aforementioned playwright Uchida’s comment that ‘anata is the best personal pronoun’, an opposite opinion was expressed by a scholar of Japanese literature, Yasaburo Ikeda. Ikeda’s dislike of the use of anata was reported as follows.

‘Shitsurei na!’ to shitauchi shitaku naru. ‘Anata’ wa meshita ni taishite tsukau kotoba da to omotteiru kara dearu. [...] ‘Anata’ o tsukau yooni natta no wa, eigo (you, your) no eikyoo to shika kangaeraremasen.
‘(That’s) rude!’, I feel like tut-tutting in frustration when someone uses anata. That’s because anata is to be used towards an inferior. I cannot help thinking that it is the English influence that (causes people to) use anata like ‘you, your’.

(Yomiuri Shimbun, 15/10/1976).

In this comment, his upholding of the social norm that anata should not be used towards a superior is expressed and it justifies his discomfort when being referred to with the use of anata. His intuition that the use of anata does not work like the English ‘you’ displays an aspect of wakimae ‘discernment’ which is regarded as almost ritualistic in Japanese
communication and is incongruent with blind adoption of language practices of the ‘West’ (Ide, 2006).

Likewise, the aforementioned woman, who sent the letter discussed earlier regarding her use of *anata* to express her individual identity, in fact revealed the following situation and sought other readers’ opinions.

‘Anata...’ to yonde, watashi kirawaretemasu. *Ie, otto ni de naku, doosei ni desu. Otto no shiriai no josei ga uchi ni mieta toki, ‘anata’ to itta rashiku, sore ga mawari mawatte ato ni natte ‘ano okusan wa watashi o baka ni shiteiru. Anata to yobarete iya datta’ to itteiru to kiki, nayande shimatta no da.
‘I am disliked by others because I use ‘anata’. No, not by my husband but by other women. When an acquaintance of my husband came to visit our place, I think I used *anata* (to refer to her). This was circulated to other people and later I heard that the woman was talking about me saying that ‘she looks down on me. I didn’t like being referred to as *anata.*’ Listening to this, I have been troubled.’

*(Asahi Shimbun, 27/09/1983)*

This women’s opinion was replied to by another female reader the following month. The replier expressed her dislike of the use of *anata* as follows.

‘Anata’ to yobareru koto ni kanari no teikoo o kanjiteshimau hitori desu. [...] Kesshite warugi ga atte itteiru no dewa nai toiu koto wa kuchoo demo naiyoo demo wakaru no desu. [...] Demo ‘anata’ no kaiwa ni tsuiteikenai toiu no mo jijitsu nano desu. [...] ‘Okusan’ nado to iwareru to, choppiri hazukashii keredo, nazeka ureshii kimochi nimo natteshimau no desu. Dare ni demo tsukau koto no dekiru kotoba yori, watashi dearu koto ga hakkiri wakaru kotoba de yondemoraereba, sore ga totemo sunnarito najimeru yobikata ni natteiru to omoimasu.
‘(I) am one of those who feel quite reluctant to be referred to with *anata.* [...] (I know) (the speaker) meant well considering the tone of the voice and the content. [...] However, it is the fact that I cannot fit (anywhere) in the conversation with the
use of anata. [...] If (I) am referred to as okusan ‘Madam’ (lit. ‘wife’, indicating ‘Mrs. someone’), (I) get a little self-conscious, but it makes me somewhat happy. If (I’m) referred to with words which clearly indicate who I am, it more smoothly fits me, rather than being referred with a word which can be used towards anyone.’

(Asahi Shimbun, 08/10/1983).

Between these two women, we can see aspects of their different identities. As we have seen earlier, the first woman wanted to use anata as an expression of her individual identity. On the other hand, the second woman’s preference is watashi dearu koto ga hakkiri wakaru kotoba ‘words clearly indicate who I am’ by which she meant words associated with her social roles. This is evident in her comment that she feels happy to be called okusan ‘Mrs. ~~~’ as someone’s wife. Outside this extract, she also mentioned that she was happy to be called Shoo-kun no obachan ‘Sho’s (i.e. her son’s) mum’ in her everyday life. In her letter, she expressed her pleasure in taking each of these roles, as a mother and a wife, and hence to be called as such, and this language practice would make her more comfortable. Her expression ‘anata no kaiwa ni tsuiteikenai ‘I cannot fit (anywhere) in the conversation with the use of anata’ expresses that she cannot feel a sense of belonging when addressed by those who insist on individuality with the use of anata. This woman’s identity is inseparable from her social roles as a mother and a wife.

Thus far, we have seen debates in the public sphere mainly through newspaper columns regarding the ‘standard’ use of anata. Native speakers’ evaluations of the ‘standard’ use of anata were inconsistent and this inconsistency gives the appearance of a debate between egalitarians vs. norm upholders. However, the debates are not simply about native speakers’ expressions of the pros and cons of the ‘standard’ use of anata. Rather, these users’ opinions display also the expression of their personal or professional
identities, which have their own history of reflexive processes in the local interactions of the individuals, yet at the same time, are inevitably positioned in the modernising society.

8.3.3. Impossibility of the symmetrical use of anata

A series of discussions in the newspaper about the use of anata also included episodes which caused users to realise the impossibility of its symmetrical use. The following article is about the use of anata in the service industry. Towards customers, anata is regarded as a ‘taboo’ word.

Depaato no ten’intachi nitotte anata wa kinku dearu. Sogo depaato wa, shinnyuushain no tameni ippankeina kokoroe o toita gaidobukku o kubatteiru. [...] Yokunai kotoba no rei o sanjuu hodo ageteiru. ‘Anata’ mo sono hitotsu de, tadasii kotoba wa okyokusama. [...] Depaato ni kuru kyaku wa okyokusama toshite taisetsuni motenashite morau koto o kitaishiteiru. Dakara, ippo sagatte, kichinto okyokusama to yobu hoo ga kyaku no manzokukan o takameru kekka ni naru.

‘For staff in a department store, anata is a taboo word. Sogo Department Store distributes a guidebook instructing new employees about general rules. There are thirty undesirable words. Anata is one of them and the correct way (to address a customer) is okyokusama (lit. customer (polite)) ‘Sir/Madam’. Customers who come to department stores expect to be treated as precious. Thus, being humble and referring to them as okyokusama increases the customers’ satisfaction.’

(Yomiuri Shimbun, 19/10/1976)

This shows that in the service industry, to garner customers’ satisfaction, self-lowering and addressee-raising is mandatory and there seems to be no room for the ‘egalitarian’ use of anata.
Further, an extreme case of ‘consequences’ of the use of *anata* in the work place was reported.

*Chuugoku ni kensetsu sareta nihon no koojoo de hataraku chuugokujin ga, soko no koojoochoo daka genba no uwayaku ni ‘anata wa...’ to hanashikaketa tameni, namaiki da to kubi ni sareta to iu episoodo ga aru.*

‘There is a story. In a Japanese factory built in China, a Chinese factory worker talked to his plant manager or a supervisor saying *anata wa*... ‘you (anata) are....’ He was labelled as ‘impertinent’ and was fired.’

(Tanaka, 1989: 23)

Experiencing this, the fired factory worker’s reflexive process would form the idea that the use of *anata* was a *chimeitekina shippai* ‘fatal mistake’ (Tanaka, 1989: 23). Readers of this episode would also form their perceptions about the use of *anata* accordingly.

While the above two examples show clear cases of impossibilities of the use of *anata* for equal footing, what these examples suggest implicitly is that even among so-called ‘egalitarians’, there inevitably exists an implicit indication of power relations in the use of *anata*. Here, it is helpful to bring Ervin-Tripp’s (1986) ‘dispensation rules’ into our discussion. Dispensation rules are norms of address that entitle only certain groups of interlocutors to initiate shifts to informal address. Regarding this, Agha (2007: 34) explains as follows.

[S]hifting to a reciprocal pattern (e.g., both individuals using informal *du*) resets the parameters of the social interaction bringing the two individuals on par. But who can initiate such a shift? In many societies, including Sweden60, the entitlement to initiate such shifts is normatively linked to interlocutor’s relative

60 Ervin-Tripp (1986) discussed this notion regarding the Swedish address system.
status: higher status interlocutors can readily propose a shift from formal to informal address, but the act cannot be initiated by a lower status individual without risk of seeming impudent.

(Agha 2007: 34)

As I showed earlier, proposing to use anata as a ‘standard’ address term came from policy makers’ radical uptake of the notion of egalitarian use of the language. The aforementioned Kindaichi (1959) and Miwa (2010) are chishikijin ‘intellectuals’ who had already gained social status as well-known scholars. It cannot be ignored that they were university professors who could be part of policy making circles, and in local interactions, they were in a position to ‘initiate’ the use of anata. Their students may have been given ‘permission’ to use anata towards the professors in their classrooms as an explicitly formed place of equal footing. However, stories of the woman who was disliked by others because of her use of anata, the factory worker who was fired after his use of anata, and the staff in the department store who were told that anata is a taboo word towards customers, suggest that there are boundaries between those who are entitled to initiate the ‘egalitarian’ use of anata and those who are not, in different layers of the local interactions. In this sense, ‘anata as a standard address term’ was, in Yasuda’s (2006: 28) words, dare no mono demo aru keredomo, kekkyoku wa dareka tokutei no hitotachi no mono ‘something that is supposed to be for everyone but, after all, is only for specific people’.

To sum up, the existing power boundaries and social norms in local interactions were not easily conquered by the top down mode of hasty egalitarianism. The usage of anata remained sensitive in discursive local interactions and did not easily become a ‘standard’ which could be used reciprocally anywhere.
By observing native speakers’ debates, what we have seen in this section is that determinate factors in anata’s usages were neither the top-down mode of language policy nor the new set of ideologies attached to anata. Rather, they were a result of cumulated reflexive processes in local communications where individuals’ personal or professional identities, their uptake of their own social positions and a certain degree of freedom in interpretation interacted with socio-culturally oriented norms and ideologically formed trends within society at the time of Japan’s post-war modernisation.

8.4. A wife’s use of anata towards her husband

Understanding the reflexive processes around the use of anata serves also to shed light on one remaining issue which I have left until now to analyse, namely, a wife’s use of anata towards her husband. In modern Japanese, a wife’s use of anata is a special case in that it is the only gender-specific use, that is, a female exclusive use of anata. Among present-day Japanese native speakers, only this use of anata is regarded as archaic and is linked somewhat to hoshuteki de hikaemena tsuma no joseitekina kyarakutaa ‘a wife’s feminine characteristics that are conservative and obedient’ (Shimotani, 2012: 90).

The temptation in the previous literature has been to invoke a direct connection between the view of anata as a formal or polite pronoun and a wife’s use of anata. That is to say, a wife uses anata towards her husband due to anata’s formal nature and this is a leftover of a male chauvinistic society (Tani, 1981: 18). From the point of view which regards anata as a polite second person pronoun in its nature, the above account fits well. However, as we have seen in Chapters 5 to 7, viewing anata as a polite address term in modern Japanese cannot explain other cases where its use is regarded as impolite. This means that making a direct connection between a wife’s use of anata and anata as a
formal/polite pronoun lacks sufficient explanation after considering all aspects of the term.

From the point of view in which *anata* entails an impolite nuance, a wife’s use of *anata* towards her husband encounters an obvious problem. There is an apparent inconsistency between *anata*’s ‘impolite’ nuance and the image of the traditional wife’s ‘polite’ use of the term. For this reason, this viewpoint has excluded a wife’s use of *anata* from analysis as a conventional use and hence regards it as an exception (Shimotani, 2012), with no need for a systematic explanation.

In fact, analysing a wife’s use of *anata* as an exception makes sense in that this use is the only case in which it is used exclusively by a wife but not by a husband, that is, it is a gender specific use. All other cases of the use of *anata* I have discussed throughout this study are cases of the non-gendered use of *anata*, in which there is no exclusivity of use between a male speaker and a female speaker. In the previous literature, despite this well-known phenomenon, the reason why a wife’s use of *anata* came to be regarded as a female exclusive form and has a stereotypical archaic nuance today has not been sufficiently explained. In other words, the previous literature has not attempted to discuss the process whereby this case has come to be perceived as what it is today.

I attempt to account for the archaic perception of a wife’s use of *anata* by showing how it has developed through a history different to the other non-gendered uses of *anata* I have discussed in previous chapters. I propose and describe the potential processes by which this usage has come to be felt archaic today as part of my comprehensive analysis of the term *anata*.

To trace a wife’s use of *anata* as a female exclusive form, it is necessary to consider the broader historical background of Japan’s language modernisation since the
Meiji era.\textsuperscript{61} As is well known, the Meiji restoration brought significant political, administrative and educational change to Japan, replacing the feudal Tokugawa government with a modern centralised state (Inoue, 2006). During the Meiji period, the process of industrialisation, commercialisation and the introduction of compulsory education involved a significant change in the way that family members functioned in their contribution to the household economy and household management (Ishii and Jarkey, 2002). An “increasing separation between productive and reproductive work and the growing clear gender-role distinction” was encouraged by the State (Ishii and Jarkey, 2002: 35). In this flow, changes to the education system increasingly targeted women’s education and the government “actively launched a project to nationalize women and shape their roles \textit{vis-a-vis} the state” (Inoue, 2006: 80). Inoue (2006) states:

\begin{quote}
It was in this context of modern social power in the form of capitalist development and state centralization that “women” as a social category became radically renewed, and “modern Japanese women” emerged as an articulable social category burdened with new cultural meanings pertinent to its relationship with the nation-state”.

(Inoue, 2006: 79)
\end{quote}

In this context, the educational system that the Meiji government enforced upon women was based on the promotion of \textit{ryoosai-kembo} ‘good wife and wise mother’ (Inoue, 2006; Nakamura, 2005, 2006). The promotion of \textit{ryoosai-kembo} advocated values and virtues of ideal womanliness which include traditional values such as obedience to fathers, husbands and later in life, the eldest male child (Inoue, 2006).\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{61} 1868-1912
\textsuperscript{62} Inoue (2006: 80) states that this derived from “the Confucianism espoused by the ex-samurai class and from the imported Western cult of domesticity”.
The *ryoosai-kembo* education prepared women for a gendered role which included efficient house management and motherhood as well as the use of ‘good’ language. In educational guidelines, the ‘women’s language’ which was associated with the notion of *ryoosai-kembo* has been characterised as indirect, soft, non-assertive and polite (Falconer, 1984; Reynolds, 1990; Suzuki, 1993; Masuoka and Takubo, 1992; Okamoto, 1997; Shibamoto-Smith, 2003; Inoue, 2004; Endo, 1992, 2006; Nakamura, 2005, 2006).

As an example, one of the educational handbooks for women, *Shinsen Onna Daigaku* ‘The Great New Learning for Women’ (1884, cited in Ishikawa (1973: 356-7)) states *Fujin no kotoba zukai wa otonashiku shitoyakani mimitatanu o yoshi to su* ‘Women’s language should be modest and gentle, and it is good not to be blatant’. Nakamura (2005) states that the difference between educational handbooks in the Edo period and the Meiji period is that the concept was transformed from women serving purely for *ie* ‘house’ to serving for *kuni* ‘nation’ in the role of *ryoosai-kembo* ‘good wife and wise mother’. In this sense, women’s language was constructed as an ideology (Inoue, 2006).

Further, another movement related to language modernisation resulted in the reinforcement of women’s language. Inoue (2006) states that gendered language was reinforced by the *gembun itchi* ‘write as you speak’ movement\(^{63}\) as well as the standardisation of Japanese language. As noted in Section 8.2, there existed the notion of language pessimism among intellectuals during the modernisation of Japan. A gap between written and spoken Japanese as well as a great diversity of mutually unintelligible dialects were regarded as barriers to the goal of the creation of a modern language for a modern nation (Inoue, 2006). The ideology of *Kokugo* ‘National

---

\(^{63}\)For details of the *gembun itchi* movement, see Yamamoto (1971).
Language’ and the notion of *Hyoojungo* ‘Standard Language’ were created at this time (Yasuda, 1997). Nakamura (2005: 114) states that *Kokugo* and *Hyoojungo* assumed the Tokyo upper-middle class language as the default and then created a distinction between *otoko no kokugo* ‘male language as the national language’ and *onnarashii hanashikata* ‘womanly way of talking’ as a separate category.

As for the *gembun itchi* style, this was the new colloquial written Japanese that progressive Meiji writers developed, forming it with the aim of seeking an adequate literary style for modern narrative prose, modelled on Western realist novels. The *gembun itchi* style reflected the highly ideological language modernisation movement noted above and it played a significant role in language users’ identity construction through the spread of print media. Inoue (2006) emphasises the importance of print media for identity construction:

> Whether in school textbooks, newspapers, magazines, fiction, scholarly essays, public speeches, legal statements, military orders, advertisements or colonial education, the new narrating voice not only provided semantico-referential information but also functioned simultaneously as “performative” to authenticate and factualize that which is enunciated.

(Inoue, 2006: 92)

A number of educational handbooks for women were published in the Meiji and Taisho periods and these books attempted to educated women on every detail of their lives, including how to manage a household, how to behave, and how to treat their husbands.66

---

64 Inoue cited this word from Lee (1997) and Silverstein (1979).
65 1912-1926
66 For example, *Onna Gojoo Kun to Gorin no Kyoo* (Uesugi, 1910) includes phrases such as *shujin to tootomi* ‘respect (your) husband’, *otto yoku tsukae* ‘serve your husband well, *otto yori sakini nezu* [...] *otto yori sakini okidete, midaregami misenu yoo* ‘do not sleep before your
Popular magazines read by women served to provide identity construction to aspiring women. Numerous other print materials, including novels that were published since the *gembun itchi* movement, represented a highly ideologically formed modern standard Japanese colloquial style.

One of the most popular writers in the late Meiji to Taisho period was Natsume Soseki. Discussing the use of *anata* in Natsume’s novels, Ishiyama (2008), in his diachronic study of personal pronouns seen in Chapter 3, points out that around the time of Natsume Soseki, the use of *anata* retained its respectful nuance as a second person pronoun. Most importantly to our current discussion, Ishiyama (2008) also points out that a wife’s use of *anata* as a female exclusive form is observed in the first Natsume novel *Wagahai wa Neko Dearu* ‘I Am a Cat’ written during 1905-1906. I consulted two of Natsume’s novels *Wagahai wa Neko Dearu* ‘I Am a Cat’ (1905-1906) and *Kokoro* ‘Heart’ (1914) and confirmed that in these novels a wife uses *anata*, and significantly, a husband does not use it. In other words, it can be said that around this time the gender-specific use of *anata* had been already established.

Observe the following example from *Kokoro*. The husband is drinking rice wine with a student who has visited them. He asks his wife to join them (In (1), H = husband, W = wife)

husband […] wake up before your husband so you do not show your messy hair’. *Katei no Shiori* (Nihon Joshi Kasei Gakuin, 1915: 5) states *Joshi wa juujun nishite mono ni sakarawanu koso tautoki mono nareba, mazu otto no kokoro ni shitagau o michi to seri* ‘women are precious only if they are obedient and do not resist. Thus, first of all, it is important to follow their husband’s will’.

67 Jarkey (2015) discusses the role of language in the identity construction of the *shufu* ‘housewife’ focusing on language use in the popular Japanese women’s magazine *Shufu no Tomo* ‘The Housewife’s Companion’. She discussed the women’s use of honorifics as indexing the linguistic signs which were “modelled for women of all classes in Taisho society as a means of attaining the indexed—the femininity of a high-class woman” (Jarkey, 2015: 182).

68 Inoue (2006) also points out that other features of language use such as a strongly gendered sentence ending style were also observed around the time of Natsume Soseki’s novels.
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In this example, it can be observed that only the wife uses anata to address her husband (line 6). On the other hand, the husband addresses his wife with omae (lines 1 and 4). As seen in Chapter 3, omae is a second person pronoun which is used predominantly by
men, regarded as vulgar and indexing the addressee’s inferiority except for its reciprocal use between close male interlocutors in informal situations. Kobayashi (1992) states that a husband’s use of *omae*, as the head of the household, to refer to his wife was a norm during feudalism.

Noticeably, while the husband uses plain expressions such as *oagari* ‘drink-IMP’ in line 1, *nomu to ii yo* ‘good (if you) drink-INF’ and *naru yo* ‘become-INF’ in line 5. The wife uses some honorific expressions such as *osshatta* ‘said-HON’ in line 3 and *meshiagaru* ‘drink-HON’. Combined with the co-occurring honorific uses by the wife, her use of *anata* can be regarded as a *keishoo* ‘honorific address term’. As Ishiyama (2008: 127) states about a wife’s use of *anata* in *Wagahai wa Neko Dearu* ‘I Am a Cat’, *anata* is “used respectfully with some degree of intimacy from a wife to a husband, but not the other way around”. Although tracing the exact origin of a wife’s exclusive use of *anata* by searching through all historical materials is beyond the scope of this study, it can be said that a wife’s use of *anata* as a female exclusive form and the asymmetrical address practice between a wife and a husband was already established around this time. This makes sense in light of the then *ryoosai-kembo* education for women and the existing patriarchal dominance under which women must speak ‘good language’ in a ‘womanly’ way. Also, from Inoue’s (2006) statement noted earlier, print media would have driven the widespread use of this special use of *anata* as part of the gendered use of language. It is worth noting that Natsume Soseki was one of the most widely read authors of the time, meaning that the way a wife speaks in his novels was exposed widely through print media.
Moving to the early Showa period\textsuperscript{69} and up until World War II, we have already seen in Chapter 3 that there existed some educational handbooks stating the proper use of address terms. After Reihoo Yookoo ‘Handbook of Manners’ (1941) by The Ministry of Education was published, the commentary book Reihoo Yookoo Kaisetsu ‘Commentary on the Handbook of Manners’ was published the following year. In this commentary book, a wife’s ‘correct’ use of \textit{anata} was explicitly stated as follows.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Fuufu dewa otto wa tsuma ni taishite wa na o yobi, tsuma wa otto ni taishite wa ‘anata’ to yobi, mata kafuu ni yotte ‘dannasama’ tomo yobu. Kachoo ni taishite wa tsuma o hajime ikkajuu no mono ga sootoona keishoo, keigo o mochiiru. Kore wa ikka no chitsujo o tamotsu ue nimo kanjin na koto dearu.}

‘Between a couple, a husband should use the name to refer to his wife and a wife should refer to her husband as ‘anata’ or ‘master’ depending on the family tradition. To the head of a family, not only a wife but also all members of a family should use appropriate honorific address terms. This is important to keep the order of the family.’

\textit{(Reihoo Yookoo Kaisetsu ‘Commentary on the Handbook of Manners’, 1942)}
\end{quote}

This commentary clearly indicates that the use of \textit{anata} between a couple should be exclusive to the wife. \textit{Anata} is placed on the same level as \textit{dannasama} ‘master’. The commentary also shows a clear asymmetry between a wife and her husband in terms of address practice, which strongly reflects the patriarchal family system which continued until a new constitution was created\textsuperscript{70} in the post war period. Given the above, it is plausible to say that a wife’s exclusive use of \textit{anata} was continuously regarded as part

\textsuperscript{69} 1926–
\textsuperscript{70} 1947
of her ‘good manners’ in address practice as part of ryoosai-kenmo ideology from the Meiji and Taisho periods until at least around this time.

Thus far, we have looked at a wife’s use of anata during the pre-war modernisation period. In contrast to this pre-war time, after World War II, the reciprocal use of anata between a wife and a husband was advocated with the aim of greater democracy and gender equality through a radical change in values. Kindaichi (1959) comments as follows:71


> ‘It seems commonly regarded that a husband uses ‘ore’ ‘omae’ and his wife uses ‘watashi’ ‘anata’. However, this does not make for the equality of men and women, although in a respectable household, a couple seem to use ‘watashi’ ‘anata’ to each other indiscriminately. Pronouns from now on will probably go in such a direction. Not only between a couple, but also in the workplace, between a superior and an inferior, and between a public servant and a citizen, if we use ‘watashi’ and ‘anata’ consistently like English ‘I’ and ‘you’, I think a democratic pronoun system will be established.’

(Kindaichi, 1959: 163)

---

71 The latter half of this quote can also be found in Section 8.2.
However, this seems to have been only an ideal vision. Instead of achieving the reciprocal use of _anata_, present-day female speakers seem to be simply abandoning the wife’s exclusive use of _anata_. In the results of the survey undertaken for the current study, the female participants who chose ‘always’ for their use of _anata_ towards their husband were observed only among those over the 40s age group, and the rate became higher in older generations (11.6% for 40’s, 16.7% for 50’s and 24.3% for 60’s). The survey results also clearly show that among married female respondents in their 20’s and 30’s, no one would regularly use _anata_ towards their husbands. Given the social norms documented in educational handbooks of early Showa, it can be interpreted from the survey results that this norm has been retained to some extent in older generations but is gradually disappearing in the 50s and 40s, and among younger generations it is not the norm anymore.

In fact, it was not until 1985 when The Equal Employment Opportunity Act was legislated that truly equal rights for women in terms of opportunities in society were officially granted. The right to advance into society equally seems to have given younger generations significantly different perceptions about their lives to those of their mothers’ generation. In her study, Inoue (2006: 259) reported on the voices of Japanese female interviewees in their 20s who had professions and had gained their economic and social independence, talking about their mothers. They clearly differentiated themselves from their housewife mothers and described their mothers’ generation with some pity “staying home and sacrificing everything for their children and husbands” (Inoue, 2006: 259). This image of their mother’s generation held by the young women in Inoue’s study is in line with the image of the wife who uses _anata_ that is held by the younger survey respondents in the current study. A respondent in her 20s made the following comment.
Genzai no yooni danjo byoodoo to iwareru yori izen, shoowa ya sore izen no tsuma ga otto ni tsuka imeeji ga arimasu. [...] Otto o sonkei shi tateru, otto no ippo ushiro ni iru tsuma toiu kanji ga shimasu. Josei no chii koojoo, shakai shinshutsu, danjobyoodoo no genjoo dewa amari kanjirarenai kanjoo kamo shiremasen.

‘I feel that a wife in the past referred to her husband (as anata), in such eras as the Showa era or even before, namely, the time before gender equality was established like today. [...] (With a wife’s use of anata), I feel the existence of a wife who treats her husband with due respect and stays one step behind her husband. Improvement of women’s status, their advance into society, and gender equality are the current state, so (we) may not really feel the same as them.’

(Respondent, 125)

In this comment, the young respondent associates the wife’s use of anata with an old era (Showa or even before), before any gender equality was established. She clearly detaches herself and her generation from the women of this ‘old era’ and treats a wife’s use of anata as something she cannot align with.

In the survey comments, a common perception among respondents is that they do not encounter this use much anymore and feel that this use is disappearing.

Tsuma kara otto e no ‘anata’ wa, ima no jidai wa iwanakunatte kiteimasu ne.

‘A wife’s (use of) anata to her husband is used less and less nowadays.’

(Respondent, 211)

Tsuma ga otto ni anata o tsukau keesu wa kanari sukanakunatteiru no dewa nai ka to soozoo (akumade soozoo) saremasu. Sooiu yobikata o shiteiru no o kiitara, retoro na inshoo o motsu kana~.

72 The Showa era was from 1926 to 1989.
‘I imagine (I can only imagine) that a case where a wife uses anata to her husband has become less and less. If I hear such a way of calling (one’s husband), I would get a ‘retro’ impression.’

(Respondent, 319)

A wife’s use of anata, which was once regarded as part of wifely good behaviour, is intimately connected to a broader notion of women’s language which was further contrived by a highly ideological movement during Japan’s modernisation. This use seems to be disappearing nowadays, not as the result of a top-down ideal about ‘the reciprocal use of anata’ in a couple but because of female speakers’ choice not to employ this usage anymore. The ‘archaic’ nuance, which is only felt in the case of a wife’s exclusive use of anata, comes from reflexive processes generated through changes in society and in women’s stance towards their position in society and gender roles.

8.5. Summary

In this chapter, I presented social discourses regarding the use of anata after the post-war language policy proposal defined it as a ‘standard’ address term. The core property of anata, that is, absolute specification of the second person entity without displaying the interlocutors’ social elements, was intuitively taken up as a symbol of democracy, deconstruction of hierarchy and equality between men and women.

Examining public debates, I have demonstrated different views regarding the notion of the ‘standard’ use of anata. I revealed that the determinate factors in anata’s usages were neither the top-down mode of language policy implementation nor the new set of ideologies attached to anata. Rather, it was a result of cumulated reflexive
processes in local communications. Users’ personal or professional identities and their stance towards their own social positions were interwoven and interacted with socio-culturally oriented norms and ideologically formed trends in society. These reflexive processes were inevitably implicated in Japan’s modernisation.

In considering this, I have also uncovered possible reflexive processes regarding the perception of a wife’s use of anata as a female exclusive form up until the present-day. A wife’s use of anata was once regarded as part of wifely good behavior, within a broader notion of ideologically constructed women’s language during the modernisation of Japan. This use seems to be disappearing nowadays because of female speakers’ choice not to employ it anymore. The social context has been changing. The ‘archaic’ nuance felt only in the case of a wife’s exclusive use of anata comes from reflexive processes generated through changes in society and in women’s current stance towards their position in society and gender roles.

After observing language users’ reflexive processes, the disparate perceptions towards this one word among native speakers comes to make sense. As Silverstein (1985: 220) states, we have seen aspects of linguistic facts and ideologies that are “irreducibly dialectic in nature” and an “indifferently synchronic-diachronic totality”.
Chapter 9

Conclusion

9.1. Introduction

This study presents a systematic analysis of the second person pronoun *anata* ‘you’, with special reference to its functions and effects. It accounts for all non-gendered uses of *anata* by identifying that the inherent property of *anata* is the absolute specification of the second person entity. To achieve this comprehensive analysis, the study employed mixed research methods, combining a self-reported survey of native speakers’ perceptions with discourse analysis. In clarifying the core property of *anata* and revealing the mechanisms of how its use interacts with the socio-cultural norms of the personal reference system in Japanese, I have shown aspects of the dynamics of interaction in Japanese address practices and communications. I have also shown how this word has been ideologically positioned in post war Japanese society. As an outcome of these things, the study also sheds light on some aspects of the nexus between language and culture.

In this final chapter of the thesis, I summarise the findings of the preceding chapters in Section 9.2. In Section 9.3 I enumerate some further implications which are drawn from the current study. Section 9.4 contains my concluding remarks.

9.2. Summary of the findings

In Chapters 1 and 2, I provided the background to the study. Chapter 1 introduced the mystery of the second person pronoun *anata*, namely, how this one term has been
regarded with such disparate perceptions, as polite/formal, impolite, distant or intimate. To solve the mystery, I proposed my research questions. I also offered a view that socio-cultural knowledge plays a crucial role in resolving these questions. This chapter also provided the rationale for the methodology, namely, the mixed methods of survey and discourse analysis, as well as stating the scope of the study to be the Tokyo standard-variety of modern Japanese.

Chapter 2 reviewed the previous literature on the use of anata and raised some issues by pointing out that those studies focused only on partial aspects of the use of anata, such as its degree of formality, deictic features, socio-cultural and cognitive aspects. Consequently, in the previous literature, the core property of this term has not been fully explored in an integrated manner. I proposed the need for a systematic analysis in order to reveal the core property of the term anata.

Chapter 3 gave an overview of three important areas which are particularly relevant to the discussion of the use of anata, being the Japanese personal reference system, social norms in Japanese communication and the history of anata. First, I outlined the norms of the overall system and usages of commonly used personal reference terms in Modern Japanese. These terms have general pragmatic rules that are classified in a fairly systematic way. Awareness of expectations about the appropriate use of these terms is crucial to an understanding of the uniqueness of the use of anata. Second, the personal reference system in Japanese strongly reflects social norms in Japanese communication. These norms are inseparable from the concept of ‘relational self’ and include the predominance of vertical relationships. Third, as the mystery of anata is partly related to the historical transition of the term, this chapter overviewed its history. By looking at diachronic studies which show the decrease in anata’s degree of
formality, the linguistic contention over the use of *anata* in Modern Japanese, which has been persistent in attempting to clarify its degree of politeness, comes to make sense.

Given that the usages of *anata* in Modern Japanese have not been made clear in the previous literature, Chapter 4 is devoted to discussing present-day native speakers’ perceptions of *anata*. It presents the results of a survey of speakers of the Tokyo standard-variety Japanese conducted in the Tokyo Metropolitan Area. The findings of the survey are summarised as follows.

First, *anata* is not regarded as a regular/default personal reference term, regardless of the interlocutors’ relative social status. While the influence of a vertical relationship was strongly observed in the respondents’ avoidance of *anata* towards a superior addressee, especially towards an official authority such as a teacher or boss, the rate of avoidance was also high towards an inferior and towards an equal. This means that the simple norm-governed account that ‘*anata* should not be used towards a superior but can be used towards an inferior’ does not reflect the sensitivity of its use. In fact, *anata* is not a word readily used even towards an inferior or an equal. Some respondents expressed their discomfort at being referred to as *anata* even by a superior.

Second, the reasons for the avoidance of the term varied depending on the addressee’s social relationship to the speaker, i.e. whether the addressee was superior, inferior or equal to the speaker. It is perceived mostly as rude when used towards official authorities such as teachers and bosses. However, rudeness is not the only reason for the avoidance of the use of *anata*. It is regarded as too business-like, distancing and detaching when used towards close superiors, inferiors and equals. There is also another perception among a small number of female speakers that its use sounds too intimate to refer to male friends. As with previous studies which have indicated different views
about the use of *anata*, the native speakers’ perceptions towards its use were also disparate in this survey. A common expression that respondents often used to describe their feeling regarding the use of *anata* was *iwakan* ‘a sense of wrongness/unsuitability’. This corresponded to the rare use of *anata* as a regular reference term. Given that regardless of the given social relationship between the interlocutors (with the exception of the case of an older-generation wife’s use of *anata*), *anata* is not suitable for use as a default address term, it can therefore be said that the use of *anata* was found to be mostly a ‘deviation’ from the static view of the norm of address practice.

Third, while this non-use of *anata* as a default address term was evident in native speakers’ responses, the results indicated that when it was used, *anata* would occur largely depending on the situation. Respondents reflected on possible situations and cases where *anata* would be used, including situations such as when fighting or arguing with a superior, when giving advice and evaluation to an inferior and when they wanted to emphasise intimacy/closeness towards an equal. These situations are seemingly dissimilar. However, they are all cases which can be regarded as a ‘special moment’. The use of *anata* seems to serve to help create a special moment in a conversation and so it makes sense that it is regarded as ‘difficult to use’ or ‘touchy’.

Given the results of the survey, it became clear that examining situational factors was crucial in order to identify the inherent property of *anata*. Chapters 5 and 6 are devoted to just such an examination. These chapters explored the environments where *anata* occurs, and empirically clarified the functions and effects of the use of *anata*.

In terms of relationships, the native speakers’ perceptual data made it apparent that placing relationships based on superior/inferior or distant/intimate axes does not suffice to create a systematic landscape for the analysis of the use of *anata*. Thus, in
In order to best identify *anata’s* core property, I classified ‘relationships’ into two broad categories. One category places the interlocutors’ relationship as being socially undefinable and the other category places the interlocutors’ relationship as socially definable. Chapter 5 dealt with the former case and Chapter 6 discussed the latter case.

In both Chapters 5 and 6, I argued the notion of ‘absolute specification’ of the second person as *anata’s* core property. As I reminded the reader, ‘absolute specification’ in my analysis means that the use of *anata* specifies the second person entity absolutely without displaying any of the addressee’s social elements in relation to the speaker, and hence no social relationship between the speaker and the addressee is overtly specified. Chapters 5 and 6 provided evidence that ‘absolute specification’ as *anata’s* core property makes possible a systematic accounting for the use of *anata*.

In Chapter 5, I analysed the use of *anata* in a context where the interlocutors’ relationship is undefinable. This context was further divided into four cases which can be summarised as follows.

First, I analysed the case where *anata* is used to address a general audience. The reason why the use of *anata* is suitable for addressing a broad audience, such as in some advertisements, is because using *anata* does not display the addressee’s social elements without other contextual information and hence does not imply a specific target audience. The property of *anata*, absolute specification, is suitable for appealing to any addressee who receives the message.

Second, I demonstrated the impersonal use of *anata* in reported speech. With its inherent property, absolute specification of a second person entity, *anata* can serve primarily as a mere person-deixis. This makes it possible for the speaker of Japanese to abstract the second person entity and take it from the immediate discourse domain to
that of a generalised story as a form of reported speech. *Anata* can behave as a non-specific or generalised addressee without displaying any social elements of the described addressee in the described situation. This evidence of the impersonal use of *anata* refutes the notion put forward in previous studies of Japanese linguistics that impersonal use of second person pronouns does not exist in Japanese. The property of *anata*, absolute specification, makes it possible.

Third, absolute specification of the second person explains cases where the use of *anata* occurs in order to refer to an unfamiliar addressee. I showed examples in a courtroom context in which a lawyer refers to the accused and to witnesses using *anata*. A courtroom is a place where it is in a sense officially required for lawyers to treat addressees as socially unrelated to them in any sense and to treat them as mere individuals, standing equally before the judges, regardless of the addressee’s actual or claimed social status. The property of *anata*, absolute specification, is suitable for use here.

Fourth, a socially undefinable relationship includes cases where the interlocutors do not know each other. The mere specification of the addressee with the use of *anata* is reported to be more acceptable or in fact unavoidable in some cases.

What was demonstrated in Chapter 5 was a group of contexts where the interlocutors’ social relationship could not be typically defined. *Anata* tends to occur more frequently in these contexts and this is precisely because *anata* has the property of absolute specification of the second person, which does not display the interlocutors’ social relationship. Importantly, the use of *anata* in these contexts does not create strong effects because these contexts benefit from an address term which does not display the interlocutors’ social relationship.
On the other hand, when the interlocutors’ social relationship is typically definable, the use of *anata* creates strong expressive effects. Chapter 6 explored this case, namely, the use of *anata* in socially definable relationships.

In Chapter 6, I recalled the importance of socio-cultural norms in the system of personal reference in Japanese communication. This is because when the interlocutors’ relationship is socially definable, there are expectations in their address practice which are required by the social norm of Japanese communication. The norm demands that interlocutors provide constant acknowledgement of the relative social space between them. The system of Japanese personal reference terms strongly reflects this norm of relationship acknowledgement.

Given this, *anata’s* property of not displaying the interlocutors’ social relationship but absolutely specifying the second person, creates a conflict with the expected norm. By using this address term, the speaker makes explicit the non-acknowledgement of any social relationship between interlocutors. Thus, against the background of the norm-governed personal reference system in Japanese communication, the use of *anata* comes to function as a departure from the norm and creates various expressive effects. The main findings can be summarised in the following three points.

First, the absolute specification of the second person, that is, the explicit expression of non-acknowledgement of the interlocutors’ social relationship, functions as a mechanism for rejection of a given social relationship between interlocutors. In some cases, the use of *anata* is observed to indicate the speaker’s persistent stance of refusing a given relationship. In other cases, it is observed as a momentary emotional explosion enacted by the speaker, enabling the speaker to temporarily ignore any acknowledgement of a given social relationship in the usual manner. The use of *anata*
can also be a deliberate strategic tool, enabling an expression of the speaker’s rejection of a given relationship in order to prepare the ground for moving onto a new relationship between interlocutors. In all of these cases, the speakers’ main concern is specifically not to acknowledge the given social relationship in the usual socially expected manner. Instead, the use of \textit{anata}, absolute specification of the second person entity, delivers the explicit message that the speaker is rejecting the existing social relationship.

Second, the property of absolute specification of the second person can serve to create a special moment. One of these cases is advice-giving. Although in advice-giving, which broadly also includes reprimanding, the speaker may not have to ‘reject’ the usual relationship, the use of \textit{anata} is a useful tool enabling the speaker to create an unusual distance from the addressee. In doing so, the speaker can create a special moment and is able to convey an important message or make an important point that the speaker deems necessary for the addressee. Another case occurs where the speaker uses \textit{anata} while criticising or challenging the addressee in a jocular manner. In this case, the speaker is superficially performing face-threatening acts such as criticising and challenging the addressee. In this sense, \textit{anata} is used in the same way it is used to reject given relationships. However, because this is done in this case in a jocular manner, it is interesting that this type of utterance seems to be perceived as an accentuation of friendliness among native speakers. This is probably the reason that younger respondents in the survey reported that they would use \textit{anata} when joking together or poking fun at each other in order to embed a special degree of friendliness.

Third, the use of \textit{anata} makes it possible for the speaker to reference the addressee’s core self, treating the addressee purely as an individual human being without considering their mutual socially constructed elements. This effect makes sense because,
ultimately and fundamentally, *anata* functions to strip social roles away and refer to the addressee’s existential self. For this reason, the use of *anata* is observed in situations where a speaker wants to convey a sincere message to an addressee, not as someone holding a certain social role in relation to the speaker, but as an absolute human being. Given this, the use of *anata* functions to deliver messages such as ‘I’m not concerned about your social elements, but am talking to you as a human being’. This function also explains why *anata* often appears in love songs and poems.

Throughout Chapter 6, I showed how the use of *anata* interacted with the norms of the Japanese personal reference system, which is strongly governed by the socio-cultural norms of Japanese communication. In a culture where relationship acknowledgement is almost mandatory in communication, the explicit ‘non-acknowledgement’ of a social relationship is a breach of the social norm. In this sense, the use of *anata* is mostly a departure from the prescriptive norm, entailing a variety of expressive effects.

Given the functions and effects of the use of *anata* in Chapters 5 and 6, Chapter 7 described a case study from the arena of parliamentary debate. Whereas there is only infrequent use of *anata* in everyday conversations, abundant examples of its use are observed in parliamentary debate. The functions of *anata* that were discussed in Chapters 5 and 6 were attested to in a parliamentary setting.

In socially undefinable relationships in a parliamentary setting, *anata* is observed in cases where the speaker uses a form of reported speech and also where the speaker refers to an unfamiliar addressee. In the former case, the speaker uses *anata* to refer to a general audience, a non-specific individual or a collective entity in reported speech. This is one of the speech techniques an MP uses when he/she describes certain documents,
experienced events, assumed situations or discussions with other parties. Anata’s property of absolute specification makes it possible to refer to the addressee as a general audience, a nameless someone or ‘the other party’ in described situations. When anata is used deictically (i.e. not in reported speech) in a socially undefinable situation, it is used to refer to an unfamiliar addressee in a witness summoning event. Anata’s power of absolute specification of the second person again serves to refer to the witness as a mere individual addressee without displaying any of his/her social elements, just like in the case of a courtroom.

When anata is used in socially definable relationships, such as between an ordinary MP and the Prime Minister, the speaker’s use of anata serves to make explicit the speaker’s non-acknowledgement of the given relative social/hierarchical positions between the interlocutors. The use of anata here is a vigorous tool for rejecting existing official authority and power. Among the various functions of the use of anata, that of rejecting a given relationship is by far the most commonly and prominently observed in parliamentary debate.

Parliamentary debate is a place of confrontation, intentional face-attack, and negotiation of power. Thus, contrary to the general notion that anata should not be used towards a superior addressee, it is a place where an inferior speaker commonly uses anata towards a superior addressee as a vehicle for contesting, resisting, denying and struggling for official authority and power. The notion of absolute specification systematically explains why we tend to observe the use of anata in this particular genre of verbal interaction.

Finally, Chapter 8 discussed the historical social phenomenon in Japan regarding the use of anata. Anata’s socially inert nature was intuited at one time by language policy
makers during the post war egalitarian trend. In 1952, _anata_ was defined as a ‘standard’ address term in a language policy proposal. It was regarded as suitable to use to any addressee in a new democratic society, just like English ‘you’. _Anata_ was taken up as a symbol of a ‘democratic address system’ enabling the deconstruction of asymmetries in any hierarchical relationships. However, while its use was nationally encouraged, it has never been widely accepted.

I discussed public debates about the use of _anata_ and in so doing, showed that there existed a variety of views regarding the notion of the ‘standard’ use of _anata_. The analysis of native speakers’ public debates revealed that determinate factors in _anata_’s usage was neither solely the top-down mode of language policy implementation nor the new set of ideologies attached to _anata_. Rather, it was the result of reflexive processes in local communications whereby individuals’ ideologies, identities, and a certain degree of freedom in interpretation interacted with socio-culturally oriented norms. Further, these reflexive processes were inevitably implicated in the broader social history of Japan’s modernisation.

In considering this, I also proposed possible reflexive processes explaining the perception of a wife’s use of _anata_ as a special case of a female exclusive form which has come to be regarded as archaic in the present-day. During Japan’s early modernisation period, a wife’s use of _anata_ was regarded as appropriate for the ‘wifely good manners’ of women’s language use. It was also unavoidably part of a broader movement of ideologically constructed language modernisation. Nowadays, a wife’s exclusive use of _anata_ towards her husband entails a particular archaic and obedient nuance, and younger female speakers do not employ this usage anymore. For this reason, this usage is regarded as almost extinct. This view stems from reflexive processes
generated through women’s current stance towards their position and gender roles in an ever-changing society.

To sum up, this study provides a systematic and comprehensive analysis of the second person pronoun *anata*. Previously, all personal reference terms in Japanese have been thought inevitably to encode the social elements of the interlocutors even without contextual information. However, *anata* does not have this feature, and this unique property of *anata* has been overlooked in the field of Japanese linguistics. While the mystery of the use of *anata* has generated both scholarly quests and a great deal of public interest, no published studies have systematically uncovered the core property of the use of *anata*. The current study shows that *anata*’s core property is that of absolute specification of the second person and that this property accounts for the various functions and effects which in turn have caused users to attach social meanings to this word. As an exceptional case, I also attempted to uncover possible reflexive processes which formed present-day users’ perceptions about a wife’s use of *anata*.

After discovering the core property of this word and analysing language users’ reflexive processes, the disparate perceptions held by native speakers towards *anata* come to make sense.

**9.3. Implications**

This study gives rise to some implications that suggest further contributions to the field of Japanese linguistics or more broadly, linguistics in general, as well as the fields of language teaching and intercultural communication. Possible contributions to and implications for future research are summarised as follows.
First, it has been more than sixty years since the proposal *Korekara no Keigo* ‘Honorific Language for the Future’ by *Kokugo Shingikai* ‘The National Language Council of Japan’ was published in 1952. From the time of the debate that occurred upon publication of the proposal right through to the present day, the usage of *anata* has not only been of scholarly interest but has been a continuous topic of popular discussion in the public realm and in social media in Japan. In this sense, the findings of this study are expected to be beneficial not only to the areas of linguistics and language policy but also to native speakers’ understanding of this word.

Second, this study may contribute to the fields of Japanese teaching and intercultural communication. Studies of the acquisition of terms of address in a second language have commonly found that second language learners tend to adopt a single address term and use it as an all-purpose address term (DuFon and Churchill, 2006; DuFon, 2010; Hassall, 2013). For example, native-English speaking learners of languages such as Japanese may handle the status-sensitive personal reference system by adopting a single address term which they feel is the closest equivalent to ‘you’ in English and then use it widely (DuFon and Churchill, 2006). For learners of Japanese, *anata* may be the first second person reference term that they learn, which could be a risky proposition. In this sense, the findings of this study are beneficial for fields relevant to the understanding of intercultural communication.

Third, this study fits into the broader research field of personal reference terms. No matter what the language, our choice of a particular personal reference term to refer to an addressee is a central concern in communication. It reflects our social attitude towards the conversation partner. As stated at the start of this study, the use of personal reference terms fulfills not only referential functions but also a variety of non-referential
or social functions. Large numbers of studies are devoted to an analysis of the use of personal reference terms.

Importantly, studies of personal reference terms show not only differences in the range of available terms but also vastly different modes of use in specific languages and cultures. This study reveals how the speaker’s choice of one address term *anata* interacts with the norms of Japanese culture, and thereby causes Japanese language users to attach complex social meanings to the word. While this current study has revealed the use of a particular term in a particular language and culture, at the same time, it suggests in turn that the same property of ‘absolute specification’ of the second person in other languages may interact differently with different norms in different cultures.

Finally, this study has set out to analyse present-day speakers’ usages of *anata*, by examining the most recent corpus, survey results and materials such as recent advertisements. At the same time, I have also overviewed the history of *anata* from the previous studies and discussed the post-war social phenomenon regarding its use and the ideology attached to it. In addition, I discussed the transformed perceptions about a wife’s use of *anata* in connection to its history. In this sense, this study suggests the benefit of a unified approach to our understanding of language, what Faudree and Hansen (2014: 227) call “the language–society–history nexus”, described also in Silverstein’s (1985) notes that were provided in Chapter 1 (represented again below for the readers’ convenience).

The total linguistic fact, the datum for a science of language, is irreducibly dialectic in nature. It is an unstable mutual interaction of meaningful sign forms contextualized to situations of interested human use, mediated by the fact of cultural ideology. And the linguistic fact is irreducibly dialectic, whether we view
it as so-called synchronic usage or as so-called diachronic change. It is an indifferently synchronic-diachronic totality which, however, at least initially—in keeping with traditional autonomous divisions of scholarly perspective—can be considered from the points of view of language structure, contextualized usage, and ideologies of language.

(Silverstein, 1985: 220)

9.4. Concluding remarks

This study has clarified the property of the second person pronoun anata in modern Japanese as absolute specification of the second person entity without displaying social elements of the interlocutors. This property means that the use of anata departs from the norm of relationship acknowledgement in Japanese communication. In this sense, the situations in which native speakers use this word show aspects of language use which are not explained by the static view of the prescriptive norm. I showed how the use of anata interacts with this socio-cultural norm of relationship acknowledgement which is strongly reflected in the system of personal reference terms in Japanese. As Garde (2013: 10) states, in different languages and cultures, person reference is said to give scope for the “bending and manipulation of otherwise idealized categories of social relationships” (Garde, 2013: 10). This study revealed an aspect of language which is more dynamic than what static norm-based rules provide, in a dynamics of interaction. In doing so, it sheds light on some aspects of the nexus between language and culture.
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人称代名詞「あなた」の使用に関するアンケート調査

このアンケート調査にご協力いただき、誠に有難うございます。回答には、正規、正確なことではありませんので、日本語母語者としての実感をお答えいただければと思います。回答時間は、ほぼ10分程度かと思われます。何卒よろしくお願い致します。記入に際しては、下記の記入例をご参照ください。

＜記入例＞

下記の人に対して「あなた」という言葉を使いますか。
・あてはまるものに○をつけしてください。
・もし対象者がいない場合（例えは兄弟がいないなど）は、「わからない」に○をつけしてください。
・①②を選んだ場合、使わない理由、使う場面・状況をもとに欄からお選びください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1つまでも使わない</th>
<th>2つ状況・場面による</th>
<th>いつも使う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
<th>理由</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>①</td>
<td>親戚に対して</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>②</td>
<td>親・親に遠慮して</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>③</td>
<td>兄・姉に対して</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

それぞれの欄から番号を選択のうえ、理由を
お書きください。
【1】下記の人にに対して「あなた」という言葉を使いますか。
・あてはまるものに〇をつけてください。
・もし対象者がない場合は、たとえば「兄弟のいないなど」は、「わからない」に〇をつけてください。
・①〜⑩を選んだ場合、使いない理由、使う場面・状況を右の欄から選ぶか、「その他」の場合にはご自分の言葉でお書きください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>号</th>
<th>人物について</th>
<th>①まったく使わない</th>
<th>②状況・場面による</th>
<th>いつも使う</th>
<th>わからない</th>
<th>理由をお選びください。</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>職務に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>児・甥に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>弟・妹に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>目上の親威に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>目下の親威に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>親しい友人（同性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>親しい友人（異性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>目上の知人（同性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>目上の知人（異性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>目下の知人（同性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>目下の知人（異性）に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>夫・妻に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>自分の子供に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>先生に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>仕事上の上司に対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>恋人がに対して</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

①「まったく使わない」を選んだ場合
1. 失礼だと思う
2. 事務的な感じがする
3. かしこまりすぎている
4. 親密すぎる感じがする
5. 突き放すような感じがする
6. なれなれしがる
7. その他
8. その他

②「状況・場面による」を選んだ場合
1. ケンカの時や、非難する時
2. 助言したり、アドバイスしたりする時
3. ほめる時
4. 親しみをこめて
5. 手紙などの文書で
6. かしこまった場で
7. その他
8. その他

ことを思いつつ、状況・場面を自由にお書き下さい。
「あなた」という言葉に関し、どのようなことでも結構ですので、ご意見をお書きください。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ご自身について</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) 出身地：（ ）都・道・府・県</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) 長期在住歴：（ ）年</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>いつ頃：（ ）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*＜記入例＞： 高校2年から現在まで など</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) 年齢：（ ）才</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 性別：〇で囲んでください。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>男性 女性 その他</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) 教育：〇で囲んでください。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>高校卒業・在学中 常大卒業・在学中 その他</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>大学卒業・在学中 大学院卒業・在学中 その他</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (6) 職業：〇で囲んでください。該当するものがない場合、その他（ ）にご記入ください。

| 会社員 学生 フリーランサーサービス業 教師 |
| 研究者 自由業 サービス業 技術者 自分業 |
| パート・アルバイト 医者 女性 主婦 介護士 |
| 政治家 公務員 会計士 マスコミ その他 |

ご協力ありがとうございました！
SURVEY

-The use of the second person pronoun anata in conversation-

Thank you very much for your time and contribution. There is no ‘wrong/correct’ answer in this questionnaire, thus, please only answer using your intuition as a native speaker. It will probably take about 10 minutes. Please refer to the explanation below for how to fill in the questionnaire. Thank you.

SAMPLE: <How to write>

(1) Do you use anata to the following addressee?

- Please tick one of the three options (I don’t use it at all/ It depends on the situation/ I always use it)
- If it is not applicable (e.g. you don’t have siblings etc.), please tick ‘I don’t know’.
- When you choose ① or ②, please choose the reasons or situations from the right hand side column. If you choose ‘other’, please write in your own words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>① I don’t use it at all</th>
<th>② I use it depending on the situation</th>
<th>I always use it</th>
<th>I don’t know</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Parents</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Please choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Older siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Please choose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Younger siblings</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>In a very formal situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do you use *anata* to the following addressee?

- Please tick one of the three options (I don’t use it at all/ It depends on the situation/ I always use it)
- If it is not applicable (e.g. you don’t have siblings/spouse etc.), please tick ‘unknown’.
- When you choose ① or ②, please choose the reasons or situations from the right hand side column. If you choose ‘other’, please write in your own words.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Older siblings</th>
<th>Younger siblings</th>
<th>Older relatives</th>
<th>Younger relatives</th>
<th>Close friends</th>
<th>Close friends (same sex)</th>
<th>Older acquaintance (same sex)</th>
<th>Older acquaintance (different sex)</th>
<th>Younger acquaintance (same sex)</th>
<th>Younger acquaintance (different sex)</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
<th>Own children</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Boss</th>
<th>Lover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I don’t use it at all</td>
<td>I use it depends on the situation</td>
<td>I always use it</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>If you chose ‘Not at all’</td>
<td>If you chose ‘Depends on the situation’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. It is rude</td>
<td>1. When I argue with/criticise the listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. It sounds too official</td>
<td>2. When I give advice to the listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. It sounds too polite</td>
<td>3. When I compliment the listener</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. It sounds too intimate</td>
<td>4. When I want to be close/emphasise friendliness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. It creates a distance</td>
<td>5. In a letter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. It is too casual</td>
<td>6. In a formal setting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td>7. Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you chose ‘Other’, please write the answer in your own words.*
Please write any opinions/comments regarding the use of *anata*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(1) Birthplace ( )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(2) How long have you lived in the Tokyo Metropolitan area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ) years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The period you have lived there ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Example: From age 11 to present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Age ( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Sex (Please circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Education (Please circle)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University post graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Occupation: Please circle or write in ( ) for &quot;other&quot;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>