

## 言 語 学

(1) あなたは日常生活において、違う種類の言葉を場面によってどのように使い分けているか、具体例をあげながら論じなさい。

(2) 次の文を読んで以下の問いに答えなさい。

(a) 下線部を日本語に訳しなさい。

(b) \* — \* のパラグラフで述べられていることについて、あなたの意見を述べなさい。

If there are scholars who, like the ordinary monolingual person, believe that most words in one language have exact semantic equivalents in other languages, there are also those who believe that no words in one language can have exact equivalents in many other languages, let alone in all the languages of the world. For example, they say, there are languages which have no personal pronouns, no words for 'you' or 'I'. Japanese is sometimes cited as an example of this. This, however, is a fallacy, not a fact. The truth of the matter is that, for cultural reasons, Japanese speakers try to avoid the use of personal pronouns. It is polite not to refer overtly to 'you' and 'I' in Japanese, and the language has developed a wealth of devices which allow its speakers to avoid such overt reference, without producing any misunderstandings. For example, there are certain verbs in Japanese (so-called honorific verbs) which are never used with respect to the speaker, and there are 'humble', self-deprecating verbs which are never used with respect to the addressee; the use of such verbs often sufficiently identifies the person spoken about as to make an overt reference to 'you' and 'I' unnecessary. But the words for 'you' and 'I' do exist and can be used when it is necessary or desired.

It is also true that many languages, especially South-East Asian languages, have developed a number of elaborate substitutes for 'you' and 'I', and that in many circumstances it is more appropriate to use some such substitute than the barest, the most basic pronoun. For example, in a polite conversation in Thai, the use of the basic words for 'you' and 'I' would sound outrageously crude and inappropriate. Instead, various self-deprecating expressions would be used for 'I' and various deferential expressions for 'you'. Many of the expressions which stand for 'I' refer to the speaker's hair, crown of the head, top of the head, and the like, and many of the expressions which stand for 'you' refer to the addressee's feet, soles of the feet, or even to the dust underneath his feet, the idea being that the speaker is putting the most valued and respected part of his own body, the head, at the same level as the lowest, the least honorable part of the addressee's body. But this does not mean that Thai has no personal pronouns, no basic words for 'you' and 'I'.

A language may not make a distinction which would correspond to that between the words 'he' and 'she', and in fact many languages, for example, Turkish, have just one word for 'he' and 'she', undifferentiated for

sex. But no known language fails to make a distinction between the speaker and the addressee, i.e., between 'you' and 'I'.

This does not mean that the range of use of the words for 'you' and 'I' is the same in all languages. For example, in Thai, the word *chán*, which Thai-English dictionaries gloss as 'I', has a range of use incomparably more narrow than its English equivalent. When used by women, it is restricted to intimates, and it signals a high degree of informality and closeness; when used by men, it signals superiority, rudeness, disrespect. But since there are no invariant semantic components which could be always attributed to *chán*, other than 'I', the heavy restrictions on its use must be attributed to cultural rather than semantic factors. In a society where references to oneself are in many situations expected to be accompanied by expressions of humility or inferiority, a bare 'I' becomes pragmatically marked, and it must be interpreted as either very intimate or very rude. But this pragmatic markedness should not be confused with demonstrable semantic complexity.

\*Similarly, in Japanese there are many different words corresponding to the English word *you*, none of which has the same range of use as the English word *you*. Nonetheless I would claim that one of these words, *kimi*, can be regarded as a semantic equivalent of *you*. Originally, *kimi* meant 'ruler, sovereign', and presumably conveyed deference or respect, but in current usage no constant and identifiable attitude can be ascribed to this word. According to some scholar, "Women use *kimi* only with intimates or those of inferior status, but men use it when speaking to strangers and in any situation". This range of use is different from that of *you*, but it can make perfect sense if we assume that in terms of meaning, *kimi* is identical with *you* SG, and that in Japan women are expected to show respect to people of equal or higher status with whom they are not intimate.\*