CINDI STURTZ SREETHARAN

Japanese Men's Linguistic Stereotypes and Realities

Conversations from the Kansai and Kanto Regions

There is very little empirical research into how men of any society use language at the everyday, local level (but see Coates 2003; Johnson & Meinhof 1997). This is certainly true in the Japanese case. The lack of investigation into Japanese men in general and their language use in particular may give the impression that any Japanese man on the street can stand as representative of the generic Japanese male and that the language style he uses is both known and normatively spoken by all Japanese men.

This chapter emphasizes the diversity among Japanese men's linguistic practices. I propose an alternative account based on ethnographically collected speech data of how individual men negotiate their own ideas of normative or stereotypical masculinity in expressing their identities through language. I examine casual conversations of men from two regions—Kanto and Kansai. Specific features considered for investigation include sentence-final particles and discourse strategies. My analysis will show that men use stereotypically masculine sentence-final particles infrequently, and that even when they do, they use them in both ideology-consistent and other ways to further particular discourse goals.

15.1. Background

15.2.1 Men, masculinity, and language in Japan

The literature on gender and speech styles in Japanese is very large. This literature can be divided into two categories: research that deals with formal linguistic differences

(phonological, morphological, lexical, syntactic, etc.) and research that deals with interactional or discourse differences (backchannels, interruptions, emotional expressivity, etc.). The former are more numerous than the latter.

Using self-report surveys and prescriptive usage rather than empirical investigation, the bulk of the studies on women's and men's differential use of formal linguistic features report that women and men are thought to use different sets of first- and second-person pronouns and sentence-final particles (SFPs) (e.g., Ide 1993, Kanamaru 1993). Other research claims that Japanese men use polite forms of verbs less frequently than women do and use a higher frequency of verb endings that are blunt, assertive, and direct (e.g., Ide 1982, Reynolds 1985, Shibamoto 1987). Men are also associated with reduced phonological forms such and *dekee* (< *dekai* 'big') and *umee* (< *umai* 'delicious') (Ide 1982).

Previous studies have provided fairly clear differences between SFPs that women and men use. McGloin (1990), Reynolds (1985), and Uchida (1993), among many others, report that Japanese men use a set of SFPs that index aggression, authority, masculinity, or intimacy, depending on interlocutor and context of interaction. Specifically, McGloin (1990) asserts that the SFPs *zo* and *ze* are used exclusively by men and are typically characterized as strongly masculine. *Zo*, however, is considered the most imposing of SFPs, conveying insistence, authority, aggressiveness, and a status higher than one's interlocutor. While McGloin's examples appear to derive from prescriptive usage or native speaker intuition, it is important that she relates the pragmatic meanings of SFPs to gender.

Uchida (1993), based on actual speech data of SFPs used by university students in the Tokyo area, finds that *ze* and *yo na* are used exclusively by men; however, she concludes that the SFPs used by women and men are becoming neutralized with regard to gender differentiation.

Investigations that address the interactional aspects of Japanese language and gender have found men to exhibit less pitch variation (Ohara 1992, chapter 12, this volume), to use a smaller and less emotionally charged lexicon (Shigemitsu 1993, Uchida 1993), to use fewer backchannels and tag questions (Kurozaki 1987, Horiguchi 1991), and to interrupt their conversational partners more frequently than women (Shigemitsu 1993, Uchida 1993).

Neither the structural nor the discursive-interactional studies of gender differences in Japanese have been linked to larger issues of language ideology, masculinity, identity, or region, although they have been linked to femininity (cf. Shibamoto 1987, Okamoto & Sato 1992, Inoue 1996). However, it has been frequently noted that Japanese speakers have notions of what it means to "talk like" a woman or man. Inoue (1996) and Okamoto (1995, chapter 2, this volume) both note that women and men recognize idealized forms of Japanese and provide numerous examples of popular (often negative) commentary about women's failure to use Japanese women's language. Specific linguistic features that trigger these responses need to be further investigated (but see chapter 12, this volume); nevertheless, it is evident that Japanese women and men have linguistic ideological positions concerning the particular language forms that they hear and use (cf. Silverstein 1979).

Ethnographic and historical documents on Japanese men indicate that prior to the Meiji era (1868–1912), the *bushidoo* warrior with his topknot and two swords was the image of manliness; after 1868, a new man emerged, an updated samurai, now showing off his masculinity by being enterprising and entrepreneurial (see Kinmonth 1981). The *bushidoo* warrior ideals had not been replaced but rather "redressed," literally, in more stereotypical Western fashion and ideologically transformed into a "company warrior" or "entrepreneurial *samurai*" (Vogel 1979). Characterizations of Japanese men as strong, silent, dependable, and so on are also abundant in popular culture materials (e.g., novels, films, songs, and commercials; cf. Davis 1996). However, systematic research on masculinity in Japan, in which the portrait of the "masculine man" is emerging, is very recent.

More recent ethnographic accounts of Japanese men note that to be masculine in Japan is to be hardworking and useful (Fujieda 1995, Gill 1999); it is to be strong and dependable on the outside (Ito 1996, Seko 2000) and yet soft on the inside (Yorifuji 1998). A masculine man excels at sports and is *tsuyoi* 'strong' at drinking alcohol (Toyoda 1997, Seko 2000); he is rhetorically adept (Rosenberger 1994) and yet paradoxically lacks eloquence (Iwao 1993, Yamada 1997).

Descriptions of Japanese men as silent, taciturn, or at least verbally restrained are not uncommon. Donahue (1998) notes that a Japanese man who is verbally serious and unexpressive has been traditionally more highly valued than one who is effusive and verbally outgoing. Similarly, Loveday claims that in formal settings of social equality between males Japanese men "take a low profile linguistically, understating, being terse, presenting an unemotional, self-restrained exterior" (1986:95). Seward comments that "Japanese men emphasize the masculinity of their speech by adopting a deep-voiced, guttural mode of speaking which is often accompanied by stern faces and stiff postures" (1968:111).

These studies give insight into different social (and sometimes sociolinguistic) behaviors that men are expected to exhibit but are limiting because they do not delineate the specific behavioral or linguistic strategies available to individual men to construct "hardworking," "strong and dependable" yet "soft-on-the-inside" selves as well as to examine how individual men deal with the ideologies of normative behavior in specific social contexts.

15.1.2   Regionality, language, and men

Until quite recently, much English language scholarship on modern Japan has focused on the Tokyo area. Japan has typically been assumed to be homogeneous at many levels, including ethnicity, class, and language, and scholarship on Japan focuses on the characteristics of the middle class in Tokyo or Kanto, part of the eastern region of Japan. However, as is increasingly recognized, a rich diversity of Japanese identities exists and proliferates.

Kansai, part of the western region of Japan, is as representative of urban Japanese people as Kanto, albeit in a slightly different way. Historically, Kanto's population was largely samurai families, while merchants were limited to the *shitamachi* 'downtown' regions (Otani 1994). Although it is currently a large commercial center,

it is better known for its administrative function and political power. This is in contrast to Osaka, which has been historically and continues today to be a major commercial center of Japan, enjoying strong economic power. Kansai, in particular Osaka, is one of the main regions that dictate popular culture trends to the rest of the nation; it is the area responsible for karaoke and most of Japan's TV comedy entertainment (*manzai*) (Sugimoto 1997).

The dialect of the Kansai region is popular throughout Japan; it is considered one of the two prestige varieties used in Japan (the other being Tokyo "standard"; see, e.g., Miyake 1995, Kunihiro, Inoue, & Long 1999). Scholars report that Kansai residents "do not hesitate to speak openly and publicly in their own language[s]"[1] (Sugimoto 1997:59); moreover, young people strive to mimic the dialect of Kansai in lieu of their own "Tokyo language," or Standard Japanese (SJ) (Onoe, Kasai, & Wakaichi 2000). The dialect is particularly loved at "home," that is, in the Kansai region itself. While the Tokyo dialect is described as monologue-esque (*monoroogu muki*; Sato 2000:65), the dialect of the Kansai region is said to be *shitashimi yasui* 'friendly/familiar/affectionate' and to have the ability to bind speakers together (Peng 2000).

Images of men specific to Kansai are difficult to obtain, at least in the research literature. Kansai natives are described as *isogashii* or *sewashinai* 'busy' and always in a hurry (Otani 1994). This image of hurriedness is matched linguistically by Peng's description of the Kansai dialect as being spoken quickly, at a fast tempo (2000:75). Whether this "hurried" image is particular to men is not clear, but images of Kansai residents certainly provide alternative gendered identities to draw upon rather than just the strong, silent, and slow *sarariiman* 'company man' of Tokyo found in popular literature. We are left to wonder how ordinary Kansai men talk and how they might utilize linguistic expressions of masculinity.

15.2.   This study

This chapter, then, examines theories of masculinity and of linguistic difference as they are instantiated in different regions of Japan. I maintain that masculinity, like language, is a dynamic force that interacts and manifests itself differently across speakers, spaces, and contexts. I do not assume that all Kansai men talk like the men in my data, nor that these men talk this way at all times. Rather, I hope to begin to make empirical inroads into potential links or connections between speech styles, masculinity, and regionality.

I analyze the conversations of men from the Kanto and Kansai regions to find out how—or whether—they express masculinity through particular linguistic features or discourse strategies, and whether there are regional or situational differences in the way they use these features and strategies. Rather than the term *Kansai dialect*, I use the more specific term *Hanshinkan dialect* (HKD) to refer to the variety spoken by Osaka and Kobe speakers. The Osaka and Kobe area in the Kansai region is commonly referred to as Hanshin, a Sino-Japanese term (*Han* refers to Osaka and *Shin* to Kobe), and its dialect is called Hanshinkan dialect, although exactly what should be included in this dialect has been debated (e.g., Wada & Kamata 1992, Hirayama 1997).

15.3.   Methods

15.3.1.   The conversations

The main data analyzed in this chapter comes from three conversations (approximately 70 minutes each): two from the HKD area and one from Kanto. The HKD conversations used in this chapter are part of a larger corpus of data (comprising over 45 hours of conversation) collected during my field research in the Kansai area of Japan, including Kobe and Osaka, from July 1998 through January 2000. The Kanto conversation is taken from the Shibamoto Smith Japanese Conversation Corpus, comprising data collected in the late 1970s by Janet S. Shibamoto (as reported in Shibamoto 1985). In each case of data collection, the participants knew the researchers were interested in language use but were not guided toward discussions of language.

All HKD data was recorded on a MiniDisc portable recording device; I was not present for any of the recordings. After being introduced (via a third party) to one man, I would then explain my research to him and, if he agreed to help, would ask him to gather one or two friends together to talk. I provided my contact with a recorder and recording instructions. I encouraged the men to have their conversations anywhere they felt comfortable talking informally. The Kanto conversation was recorded on a Sony TC-800A open reel recorder with an attached microphone. The investigator was present during this recording; however, based on the informality of the forms used, the conversations were judged to "sound natural" by native speakers of Japanese (Shibamoto 1985:74).

All of the men were in the career stage of their lives[2] and, at the time of each recording, all were employed by Japanese companies. The Kanto conversation has three participants and takes place in the men's company lunchroom. The three men—Shibata, Mihara, and Kawamura[3]—are each 34 years of age and are coworkers. The Kobe conversation has four participants and takes place in a local *okonomiyaki-ya*, a shop that sells a pizza-pancake kind of food found throughout Japan. The four men, like their Kanto counterparts, are co-workers; they are Sato (42 years old), Yamada (38 years old), Honda (45 years old), and Nakayama (29 years old). Despite their slightly disparate ages, they are a closely knit group and have attended one another's weddings. The Osaka conversation has two participants—Tanaka (40 years old) and Honda, who also appeared in the Kobe conversation. It takes place in Honda's company office. The men have been friends for a long time and often join each other on both private and company sporting excursions. They are coworkers, although in different sections of the same company.

Each conversation was transcribed and coded for a variety of features; in this chapter I examine the use of SFPs as discourse strategies. SFPs were chosen because the recent findings by Inoue (1996), Okamoto (1996, 1998), and Ogawa and [Shibamoto] Smith (1997) raise questions about how speakers actively use SFPs to subvert or conform to traditional or stereotypical notions of gender.

One additional HKD conversation is analyzed later, but not with respect to SFPs. In this conversation, I focus on the use of highly marked stereotypical masculine linguistic practices, including phonological, lexical, and morphological features. This conversation is by two men—Ito and Kado—from the Kawachi region of Osaka

Prefecture. The Kawachi dialect is stereotypically associated with rough or rude speech and, perhaps consequently, with male speech. Both Ito and Kado are 67 years old and retired. Ito's son is married to Kado's daughter. Thus, Ito and Kado have known each other for as long as their children have been married, about 15 years, and frequently interact via their children and grandchildren.

15.3.2.   Stereotypically gendered categories of SFPs

The SFPs identified in this chapter are based on previous studies of SFPs and on grammar texts (cf. Fujiwara 1982, 1985, 1986; Komatsu 1988; Okamoto & Sato 1992; Kawashima 1999). Table 15.1 shows stereotypical gender categorizations of SFPs; each category has two subcategories, HKD and SJ.

The categorizations for SJ are based on the vast literature on this topic (e.g., Kawaguchi 1987, Okamoto & Sato 1992); the categorizations for HKD are based on a less vast and perhaps a less strictly academic literature (e.g., Kamata 1979; Fujiwara 1982, 1985, 1986; Makimura 1984; Wada & Kamata 1992; Yamamoto 1995; Hirayama 1997). Thus, it is important to note that for both HKD and SJ the categorizations are ideological or prescriptive in nature.

While it is not always possible to separate dialect usage cleanly from SJ, the men from Hanshin display quite typical HKD features at the lexical and morphological levels. However, they also use SJ; the usage is highly mixed at the morphological, lexical, and syntactic levels. Following are examples of two HKD features drawn from my data. Because this chapter focuses on masculinity, examples 1 and 2 are only of those SFPs that are associated with stereotypically masculine gender. (For explanation of those HKD SFPs that are considered to be neutral with regard to gender see, e.g., Hirayama 1997.)

(1)   [HKD] *moratteru no kai*?
    (cf. [SJ] *moratte iru no ka*?)
        'Do you receive it'?

TABLE 15.1 Stereotypical gender categorization of sentence-final particles in Standard Japanese and Hanshinkan dialect

	Strongly masculine	Moderately masculine	Neutral	Moderately feminine	Strongly feminine
HKD	*yan ke* *jai*	*ga na; wai;* *kai*	*ya n(ai)(ka)* *de; non* *nen/ten (na)* *shi; de ne; na*	*ya wa*	
SJ	*zo* *ze* *na*	*da yo; kai* *ka na; mon na* VB/ADJ + *yo na* *sa;* VB/ADJ+ *yo* *ja n; ke*	VB/ADJ + *yo ne* VB/ADJ + *ne* *wa↓* Q *no↑*	*mon/o* NOM + *ne* VB/ADJ + *no↓*	*kashira* VB/ADJ + *no(yo)(ne)* VB/ADJ + *wa(yo)(ne)* NOM + *na no(yo)* NOM + *yo; wa↑*

VB = verb; ADJ — adjective; NOM = nominal form; Q = question; ↓↑arrows indicate falling or rising intonation.

The form *kai*, equivalent to the interrogative final particle *ka* in SJ, is considered to be masculine in both SJ and HKD; it is used to express strong opposition to something said by an interlocutor (Makimura 1984, Kawashima 1999).

(2)   [HKD] *mainichi, nikkee o yomu no? erai ga na*
    (cf. [SJ] *mainichi, nikkee o yomu no? rippa ja nai ka*)
        'You read the *Nikkei* [Japanese Economic Newspaper] every day? That's amazing, isn't it!'

The ending *ga na* is an emphatic equivalent of the SJ form *ja nai ka* 'isn't it?'. It is considered stereotypically masculine in HKD (Makimura 1984).

15.4.   Results and discussion

15.4.1.   Quantitative analysis

Not all of the SFPs listed in table 15.1 were used within the segments under investigation. The subset of SFPs included in my analysis is shown in table 15.2.

Table 15.3 presents the distribution of SFPs according to their gender categories. The neutral count and percentage do not include the absence of SFPs, which is normally considered neutral; the percentage is calculated against the total SFPs possible.[4]

There are some notable differences across the conversations. First, I examine the conversation of the Kanto men. They use neutral forms most frequently (40%), followed by masculine forms (22%), and feminine forms the least (9.1%). The form *da yo* is considered to be moderately masculine, at least ideologically (see table 15.1). However, it is used rarely by the Kanto speakers (4 times, or 2.3%). Likewise, the standard strongly masculine SFP *na* is used only 9 times (8%) by the Kanto speakers. *Zo* and *ze*, two of the strongly masculine forms, are never used. Rather, the neutral form *ne* is overwhelmingly the SFP of choice. The Kanto men do make use of the relatively masculine SFP adjective/verb + *yo* and other moderately masculine forms (29 times, or 17%). Among feminine forms, the moderate forms ADJ/VB + *no*((4%) and NOM + *ne* (3.4%) were most favored.

Turning to the Osaka conversation next, we see a slightly different pattern emerging. These speakers overwhelmingly use neutral SFPs (49%—with 27% in SJ and 22% in HKD). They split the rest of their SFP usage equally into moderately mascu-

TABLE 15.2 SFPs used in the analysis

	Strongly masculine	Masculine	Neutral	Feminine	Strongly feminine
HKD		*ga na* *kai*	*ya n(ai)(ka)* *wa ↓; de* *na; nen/ten*		
SJ	*na*	*kai; da yo* ADJ/VB + *yo* *sa*	ADJ/VB + *yo ne* ~TE/ADJ/VB + *ne* *wa ↓;* Q *no↑*	*mon/o* NOM + *ne* ADJ/VB . *no↓*	ADJ/VB + *no ne* ADJ/VB + *no yo* NOM + *yo*

TABLE 15.3 Percentage of stereotypical gendered SFPs used in each conversation

	Kaato	Osaka	Kobe
Strongly masculine	9 (5.0%)	0	0
Moderately masculine	29 (17.0%)	9 (4.4%)	36 (13.0%)
Neutral	70 (40.0%)	101 (49.0%)	119 (43.3%)
Moderately feminine	13 (7.4%)	9 (4.4%)	8 (3.0%)
Strongly feminine	3 (1.7%)	0	6 (2.2%)
Total			
Masculine	38 (22.0%)	9 (4.4%)	36 (13.0%)
Feminine	16 (9.1%)	9 (4.4%)	14 (5.2%)
Neutral	70 (40.0%)	101 (49.0%)	119 (43.3%)

line SFPs and moderately feminine forms (4.4% in each case, all in SJ). They make use of neither the strongly masculine nor the strongly feminine SFPs.

Finally, looking at the Kobe speakers we find that they also use neutral forms most frequently (43.3%); they use masculine forms 13% of the time (all moderately masculine, with 10.5% in SJ and 2.5% in HKD) and feminine forms 5.2% of the time (3% moderately feminine and 2.2% strongly feminine, all in SJ).

The speakers' patterns of SFP use do not conform to one another; more crucially, they do not correspond to those described in the literature for male speakers. Japanese men, at least those in my data, are not taking advantage of SFPs as a place to index their gender. Overwhelmingly, all speakers from each region use neutral SFPs with a much higher frequency than they use moderately or strongly masculine ones. Further, they occasionally use feminine particles.

While no speakers use strongly and moderately masculine forms frequently, the Kanto speakers have a much higher usage (22%) than either the Osaka (4.4%) or the Kobe speakers (13%). Further, gendered forms used by Osaka and Kobe speakers are primarily SJ forms. These findings may be partially explained by the fact that the ideology of gendered language has been more prominent in SJ than in other dialects.

15.4.2.   Qualitative analysis

While it is true that these men do not use masculine SFPs the majority of the time, it is important to investigate the contexts in which they are using these forms. The following examples illustrate how masculine SFPs are qualitatively used by both SJ speakers and HKD speakers.[5]

(3)   *da yo*   *iya nai nai, dakara komaru n da yo*   [CT, Mihara, #13]
'Uh, no, no [it doesn't], that's why it's a problem!'

(4)   *da yo*   *marukkiri onaji da yo*   [CT, Mihara, #43]
'They are exactly the same'.

In examples (3) and (4), Mihara uses the stereotypically masculine sentence final form *da yo*. The participants in the Tokyo conversation are discussing accents (*namari*) in Japan. Shibata states that he is originally from Iwate Prefecture (in the northeast of Japan) but that he does not find Iwate to be known for an accent nor does he have an accent himself.[6] Upon his saying this, Mihara responds with example (3), a complaint that Shibata's lack of accent is a problem, and laughter by all speakers follows. Mihara here seems to be using the masculine form *da yo* to express his complaint in a direct and forceful manner. The complaint here is not a serious one; it is a kind of banter only allowable when the appropriate degree of intimacy obtains. Its humorously forceful expression is indexing friendship or solidarity rather than a serious, forceful complaint.

In example (4), Mihara again uses *da yo*. The men are still discussing dialect variation within Japan and how it correlates with gender differences in speech. Mihara mentions that his wife is from Fukushima, where the regional dialect (according to Mihara) does not exhibit gender differences. Mihara says that *minna onaji yoo ni shabetteru kedo* 'everyone talks the same', to which Kawamura says *dakedo onaji ja nai↓*'but they're not the same' with falling intonation. Mihara responds with example (4), confirming that, indeed, the language that women and men in the Fukushima region speak is exactly the same. In this case, I suggest that Mihara is using the masculine form *da yo* to make a strong disagreement, which in turn may index his expert knowledge and authority, because he thinks he is most knowledgeable about the Fukushima dialect, the dialect of his wife, and because he originally established the topic of regional dialects and has contributed more to this topic than the other two speakers. Consequently, when Kawamura opposes Mihara's statement, he linguistically points to himself as the expert by using the stereotypical masculine form of authority: *da yo*.

I turn now to how HKD speakers use stereotypically masculine SFPs within the context of their conversations. Examples 5 and 6 involve the forms *ga na* and *kai*.

(5)   *kai*   *ee n kai na*   [CK, Sato, #82]
'That's good, isn't it'.

(6)   *ga na*   *ee kotcha ga naa*   [CK, Honda, #192]
'That's nice, isn't it?' (sarcastically)

Examples (5) and (6) occur during a discussion of the free gifts that one is offered in exchange for signing up for newspaper home delivery. Yamada begins the topic by saying that recently someone came by his home offering the newspaper *Yomiuri Shimbun* free for one year if he signed up for a three-year delivery contract. Sato responds with example (5). Yamada continues his topic by naming the items he has received in the past (cookware and salad oil), noting that he has gotten over 10,000 yen in goods from these "deals." Nakayama joins in the conversation, saying that he is "unable to run out of dishwashing liquid" even though he tells the sales representatives not to bring it. At this point, Honda sarcastically utters (6), "That's nice, isn't it?"

In these examples, Sato and Honda listen, give minimal responses, and offer some kind of evaluation that utilizes stereotypical masculine final forms to index their

sympathy and support for the two complaining men. The support is not to be confused with nurturing; it is "manly" strong support, and this "manliness" is indexed through the final forms and the dialect itself. The dialect bolsters the camaraderie and friendship ties that the men have with one another.

In all cases, the men creatively and deftly use stereotypically masculine SFPs. They are not using these final forms necessarily to jockey for position, establish a position of authority, or show status; they are joking and giving support as well as showing authority. It seems that the men are aware of the stereotypical functional values of these final forms given their use of them, albeit infrequently, in an ideological fashion.

Although the men in these conversations do not seem to be relying heavily upon SFPs as a resource for marking masculine linguistic behavior, this does not necessarily mean that they are not or do not know how to be masculine. Other linguistic sites need to be investigated to identify other potential places where men do gender work, if, in fact, they do. What follows is a brief excerpt taken from a conversation between two men from the southern part of Osaka. These men, like those whose conversations are analyzed earlier, do not use SFPs as a place to mark their masculine gender (Sturtz 2000). However, in example (7) they indicate that they are capable of using highly stylized stereotypical masculine linguistic features such as trilled /r/ and rough command forms to enact masculinity. This excerpt underscores the need for further investigation of other potential sites of gender work.

In this conversation, Ito and Kado are talking about how today's young people have no manners and do not learn to say "thank you," "excuse me," "I am sorry," and other mannered formulas properly. They focus on the failure to say "excuse me" when people collide with one another on foot or bicycle. At this point, Kado invites Ito to join him in the performance of a bicycle accident. In the excerpt given here, the two men display their ability to negotiate and manage conflict in a situationally proper, manly manner—that is, through vulgar, crude, and rough speech.[7]

(7)   K: *soohoo ga hashittemashite, gashan-tto yarimashita. taoremashita. <aita!>*

I: *<mazu> watashi wa "omae nani shitton nen" to yuu koto o mazu yaru deshoo na.*

K: *soo deshoo na.*

I: *"omae nani shitton nen" to*

K: *"ware" maa, warui kotoba desu to "warre* [trilled r] *nan ya sono hashirikata wa" t-to*

I: *sono hashirikata wa nan ya, to yuu koto de "omae aho chau ka" yuu kotoba ga, mazu, dete kuru deshoo na, ee.*

K: *"yarre* [trilled r] *sonna supiido dashiyagatte, sonna ni hashitorru kara ataru n ya nai ka" to*

I: *un, "ataru n ya nai ka" to yuu*

K: *"mae mite hashire! doko muitotten?"*

I: *un, soo yuu kotoba deshoo na.*

English Gloss:
K: We both are riding our bikes, *Gasshan!* [sound of bikes colliding], we collide and fall down. *<aita!>* [sound of shock/anger]

I: <at the least> I would say, at the least, **"What the hell are you doing?!"**

K: Yeah, that's right, isn't it.

I: "What the hell are you doing?!" [I would say]

K: The word *"ware"* [you] is bad, but, **"Hey asshole, you drive too fast; what kind of fucked-up bike riding is that [you're doing]"** [I would say]

I: I'd say, **"What kind of bike riding is that?!"** and at least something like **"You're a fool/asshole!"** would probably come out [of my mouth].

K: **"If you speed that much and ride your bike, that's why you hit me!"**

I: uh-huh, **"You'll hit someone,"** you'd say

K: **"Look in front of you when you ride! Where the hell were you looking?!"**

I: Yeah, that's the kind of words we would use, right.

In this conversation, Kado overtly invites Ito to participate in a role play of two bikes colliding. Kado trills his /r/ sounds, which is not typical of the phonology of either SJ or HKD but rather is stereotypically associated with working-class male speakers or with TV gangsters. Moreover, prescriptively nongeminated forms are geminated (for example, *shitton* 'doing'). There appears potentially to be a correlation between rude or gruff speech and "hyper-geminated" forms; further research across more speakers is necessary to confirm this hypothesis. The boldface segments exhibit stereotypical masculine speech style in their forms—that is, the verbs are marked neither for politeness nor for honorifics; in other words, the style is rude, coarse, and quite rough. For example, in *"Mae mite hashire!"* 'Look in front [of you when you] ride!', the verb *hashiru* 'ride' (lit., 'run') is in the command form of *hashire*; there is no mitigation of the on-record rebuke. The pronouns are stereotypically strongly masculine forms; for example, the crude masculine second-person pronoun *warre* is used. The overall style is unelaborated and very curt. In short, this metalinguistic discussion is filled with boorish, vulgar, and rude utterances.

The conversation that precedes and follows the bicycle accident role play does not make use of these extreme stereotypical masculine styles, but this metalinguistic demonstration gives a clear indication that these men are capable of producing stereotypical masculine styles, and of judging under what circumstances such styles are appropriate and, indeed, effective.

15.5.   Conclusion

The SFPs used and the way that they are used by the men in Kanto and HK are different not only from one another but also from what would be expected from traditional gendered classifications of SFPs (as seen in table 15.1). My findings challenge the idea that there is a single *danseego* 'Japanese men's language', or (male) "Standard Japanese." None of the men in any of the conversations ever called upon the most marked SFPs available to them, such as *zo* and *ze*. The moderately masculine form *da yo* was used by the Kanto speakers only a few times and never by the HKD speakers. This suggests that the traditional gendering of SFPs is ideological and that in reality (at least in ordinary conversations) male speakers do not resort to the exclusive or frequent use of masculine forms to express stereotypical (or old-fashioned) masculinity.

It is clear, however, that men can use language to create and inhabit specific stances (e.g., camaraderie, support, authority, anger, vulgarity, gangster-associated identity). Examples (3) through (6) show that the men are able to use the stereotypically masculine final particles both beyond and within their ideological uses. By using the forms variously to enact a joking or an authoritative context, the men show how these final forms can be used as creative as well as presupposing indexes (Silverstein 1976). Furthermore, in example (7), Kado and Ito use rude and rough language in an imaginary conversation to show how to be angry in appropriate situations. Although this is hardly surprising, heretofore men (Japanese or otherwise) have rarely been awarded recognition of this linguistic "prowess."

Large differences were not observed across the Kanto and Kansai regions of Japan. While it is true that Kanto speakers use more traditionally masculine final forms, all speakers produce neutral forms (including the absence of an SFP) much more than any gendered form available to them. The HKD speakers do favor dialect final forms somewhat over equivalent SJ forms. It is not that the SJ forms are not available to the HKD speakers (as is easily seen by the high use of other SJ forms), but it is possible that for HKD speakers, SJ forms index something more than "just stereotypical masculinity." Using the SJ forms to create or display camaraderie, for instance, may not be effective for HKD speakers.

This chapter has been a preliminary study only. Regionality still needs much more attention (but see chapter 10, this volume). Class distinctions and identification also demand much more consideration, for both female and male speakers. In order to get an encompassing picture of what is going on with Japanese men's linguistic practices, we must look across regions, class, genders, and ages to identify and begin to sustain an understanding of how men and their dynamic identities are arrayed across Japanese real space.

Notes

I would like to thank Janet S. Shibamoto Smith and Shigeko Okamoto for their careful and valuable comments. This research was supported by the Kobe College Corporation Graduate Fellowship and the National Science Foundation.

1. I add the plural languag[es] here to recognize the variation within the Kansai dialect.
2. Plath (1989), Skov and Moeran (1995), and Traphagan (2000) suggest that life stage stratification is quite salient in Japanese society.
3. All of the names that appear in this chapter are pseudonyms. .
4. The neutral total for the Osaka and Kobe speakers represents the combined total of SJ and HKD. The Osaka speakers used 56 (27%) SJ forms and 45 (22%) HKD forms, totaling 49% combined; the Kobe speakers used 62 (23%) SJ forms and 57 (20.3%) HKD forms, totaling 43.3% combined. All gendered SFPs produced by the HKD speakers from Osaka were SJ, although Kobe speakers occasionally used an HKD-gendered SFP.
5. The information in brackets includes the conversation (C = Conversation, O/K/T = Osaka/Kobe/Tokyo), the speaker's name and the clause number from the conversation.
6. Although from Iwate Prefecture, Shibata has lived in Tokyo for several years and exhibits Tokyo dialect throughout the conversation.

7. Square brackets indicate author's note, angled brackets (< >) indicate overlap, of the words within, and boldface text indicates metalinguistic speech under discussion. The translations are mine, done with help from male native speakers of HKD.

References

Coates, Jennifer (2003). *Men talk: Stories in the making of masculinities.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Davis, Darrell (1996). *Picturing Japaneseness: Monumental style, national identity, Japanese film.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Donahue, Ray (1998). Japanese culture and communication: Critical cultural analysis. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.

Fujieda, Mioko (1995). Ehon ni miru onna (no ko) zoo, otoko (no ko) zoo (Images of women (girls) and men (boys) in picture books). In T. Inoue, C. Ueno, and Y. Ehara (eds.), *Hyoogen to media (Expression and media)*, 173–192. Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Fujiwara, Yoichi (1982). *Hoogen bunmatsushi "bunmatsu joshi" no kenkyuu (Research on dialectal sentence-ending particles "sentence-final particles")*, vol. 1. Tokyo: Shun'yodo.

———(1985). *Hoogen bunmatsushi "bunmatsu joshi" no kenkyuu*, vol 2. Tokyo: Shun'yodo.

———(1986). *Hoogen bunmatsushi "bunmatsu joshi" no kenkyuu*, vol. 3. Tokyo: Shun'yodo.

Gill, Tom (1999). Yoseba no otokotachi (Men of the *yoseba*). In Y. Nishikawa and M. Ogino (eds.), *Kyoodoo kenkyuu: Danseeron (Collaborative research on men)*, 17–43. Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin.

Hirayama, Teruo (1997). *Osaka-fu no kotoba (Osaka Prefecture's language)*. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Horiguchi, Sumiko (1991). Aizuchi kenkyuu no gendankai to kadai (The issues and stages of *aizuchi* research). *Nihongogaku* (10): 31–41.

Ide, Sachiko (1982). Japanese sociolinguistics: Politeness and women's language. *Lingua* 57: 357–385.

———(1993). Sekai no joseego, Nihon no joseego: Joseego kenkyuu no shintenkai o motomete (Women's language of the world, women's language of Japan:Searching for new developments in women's language research). *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 4–12.

Inoue, Miyako (1996). The political economy of gender and language in Japan. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, St. Louis, MO.

Ito, Kimio (1996). *Danseegaku nyuumon (Introduction to men's studies)*. Tokyo: Sakuhinsha.

Iwao, Sumiko (1993). *The Japanese woman: Traditional image and changing reality*. New York: Free Press.

Johnson, Sally, and Ulrike Hanna Meinhof (eds). (1997). *Language and masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kamata, Ryoji (1979). *Hyogoken hoogen bunpoo no kenkyuu (Research on the grammar of Hyogo-ken dialect)*. Tokyo: Sakura Hosha.

Kanamaru, Fumi (1993). Ninshoo-daimeeshi, koshoo (Personal pronouns and address terms). In S. Ide (ed.), *Joseego no sekai (The world of women's language)*, 15–32. Tokyo: Meiji Shoin.

Kawashima, Sue (1999). *A dictionary of Japanese particles*. New York: Kodansha.

Kawaguchi, Yoko (1987). Majiriai danjo no kotoba: Jittai choosa ni yoru genjoo (The intersecting speech of men and women: The current situation as assessed by survey). *Gengo Seekatsu* 429: 34–39.

Kinmonth, Earl (1981). *The self-made man in Meiji Japanese thought: From samurai to salary man*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Komatsu, Hisao (1988). Tokyogo ni okeru danjosa no keeshiki: Shuujoshi o chuushin to shite (The form of gender differences in Tokyo dialect: Centering on the sentence-final particles). *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 65(11): 94–106.

Kunihiro, Tetsuya, Fumio Inoue, and Daniel Long (1999). *Takesi Sibata: Sociolinguistics in Japanese contexts*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kurozaki, Yohei (1987). Danwashinkoojo no aizuchi no unyoo to kinoo (The function of *aizuchi* to the advancement of conversation). *Kokugogaku* 150: 15–28.

Loveday, Leo (1986). *Explorations in Japanese sociolingusitics*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Makimura, Shiyo (1984). *Osaka kotoba jiten* (*Dictionary of the Osaka language*). Tokyo: Kodansha.

McGloin, Naomi Hanaoka (1990). Sex difference and sentence-final particles. In S. Ide and N. H. McGloin (eds.), *Aspects of Japanese women's language*, 23–41. Tokyo: Kuroshio.

Miyake, Yoshimi (1995). A dialect in the face of the standard: A Japanese case study. In J. Ahlers, L. Bilmes, J. S. Guenter, B. A. Kaiser, and J. Namkung (eds.), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 217–225. Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society.

Ogawa, Naoko, and Janet S. [Shibamoto] Smith (1997). The gendering of the gay male sex class in Japan: A preliminary case study based on *Rasen no Sobyoo*. In A. Livia and K. Hall (eds.), *Queerly phrased: Language, gender, and sexuality*, 402–415. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ohara, Yumiko (1992). Gender-dependent pitch levels: A comparative study in Japanese and English. In K. Hall, M. Bucholtz, and B. Moonwomon (eds.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, 469–477. Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group.

Okamoto, Shigeko (1995). "Tasteless" Japanese: Less "feminine" speech among young Japanese women. In K. Hall and M. Bucholtz (eds.), *Gender articulated: Language and the socially constructed self*, 297–325. New York: Routledge.

——— (1996). Indexical meaning, linguistic ideology, and Japanese women's speech. In *The Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, Berkeley: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 290–30.

——— (1998). The use and non-use of honorifics in sales talk in Kyoto and Osaka: Are they rude or friendly? *Japanese/Korean Linguistics* 7: 141–157.

Okamoto, Shigeko, and Shie Sato (1992). Less feminine speech among young Japanese females. In K. Hall, M. Bucholtz, and B. Moonwomon (eds.), *Locating power: Proceedings of the Second Berkeley Women and Language Conference*, 478–488. Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group

Onoe, Keisuke, Seiji Kasai, and Kooji Wakaichi (2000). Interview: Osaka no kotoba, Osaka no bunka (Osaka language, Osaka culture). *Gengo* 29(1): 14–39.

Otani, Kooichi (1994). *Osaka Gaku* (*The study of Osaka*). Tokyo: Shinkosha.

Peng, Fei (2000). Gaikokujin kara mita Osaka kotoba (Osaka language from the perspective of a foreigner). *Gengo* 29(1): 73–79.

Plath, David (1989). Arc, circle, and sphere: Schedules for selfhood. In Y. Sugimoto and R. Mouer (eds.), *Constructs for understanding Japan*, 67–93. London: Kegan Paul International.

Reynolds, Katsue Akiba (1985). Female speakers of Japanese. *Feminist Issues* 5: 13–46.

Rosenberger, Nancy (1994). Indexing hierarchy through Japanese gender relations. In J. Bachnik and C. Quinn (eds.), *Situated meaning: Inside and oustide in Japanese self, society, and language*, 88–112. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Sato, Makoto (2000). Osakaben no seeshin (The spirit of Osaka dialect). *Gengo* 29(1): 60–65.

Seko, Koji (2000). *Koo yuu otoko ni naritai* (*I want to be a man like that*). Tokyo: Chikuma Shobo.

Seward, Jack (1968). *Japanese in action*. New York: Weatherhill.

Shibamoto, Janet S. (1985). *Japanese women's language*. New York FL: Academic Press.

——— (1987). The womanly woman: Manipulation of stereotypical and non-stereotypical features of Japanese female speech. In S. Philips, S. Steele, and C. Tanz (eds.), *Language, gender, and sex in comparative perspective*, 26–49. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Shigemitsu, Yuka. (1993). Kaiwa no pataan (Conversational patterns). *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 135–140.

Silverstein, Michael (1976). Shifters, linguistic categories, and cultural description. In K. Basso and H. Selby (eds.), *Meaning in anthropology*, 11–56. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

——— (1979). Language structure and linguistic ideology. In P. R. Clyne, W. Hanks, and C. L. Hofbauer (eds.), *The elements: A parasession on linguistic units and levels*, 193–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Skov, Lise, and Brian Moeran (1995). Introduction: Hiding in the light: From Oshin to Yoshimoto Banana. In L. Skov and B. Moeran (eds.), *Women, media, and consumption in Japan*, 1–74. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Sturtz, Cindi (2000). Being and becoming (Japanese) men at 67. Paper presented at the 99th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, CA.

Sugimoto, Yoshio (1997). *An introduction to Japanese society*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Toyoda, Masayoshi (1997). *Otoko ga "otokorashisa" o suteru toki* (*When men throw away "masculinity"*). Tokyo: Asuka Shinsha.

Traphagan, John (2000). Reproducing elder male power through ritual performance in Japan. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Gerontology* 15: 81–97.

Uchida, Nobuko (1993). Kaiwa-koodoo ni mirareru seesa (Sex differences seen in conversational patterns). *Nihongogaku* 12(6): 156–168.

Vogel, Ezra (1979). *Japan as No. 1: Lessons for America*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wada, Minoru, and Ryoji Kamata (1992). *Hyogo no hoogen, rigen* (*Hyogo's dialect and slang*). Kobe: Kobe Shimbun Sogo Shuppan Senta.

Yamada, Haru (1997). *Different games, different rules: Why American and Japanese misunderstand each other*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Yamamoto, Toshiharu (1995). *Osakaben no ruutsu o saguru*. In NHK Osakaben Project (ed.), *Osakaben no sekai* (*The world of Osaka dialect: Searching for the roots of Osaka dialect*), 54–63. Tokyo: Keidoo Shoin.

Yorifuji, Kazuhiro (1998). *Ii otoko mitsuketa!* (*I found a good man!*) Tokyo: Kaneko Shobo.

Reinventing Identities: The Gendered Self in Discourse
    Edited by Mary Bucholtz, A. C. Liang, and Laurel A. Sutton

Pronoun Envy: Literacy Uses of Linguistic Gender
    Anna Livia

Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People
    Edited by Shigeko Okamoto and Janet S. Shibamoto Smith

Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology

Cultural Models and Real People

Edited by
Shigeko Okamoto
Janet S. Shibamoto Smith

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2004

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS