

Title	Power and solidarity as observed in the forms of address/reference in Japanese political discourse : focusing on selected samples from the Minutes of the Diet (2001-2005) in BCCWJ
Sub Title	
Author	Kim, Angela A-Jeoung
Publisher	慶應義塾大学日本語・日本文化教育センター
Publication year	2012
Jtitle	日本語と日本語教育 No.40 (2012. 3) ,p.19- 47
JaLC DOI	
Abstract	
Notes	論文
Genre	Departmental Bulletin Paper
URL	https://koara.lib.keio.ac.jp/xoonips/modules/xoonips/detail.php?koara_id=AN00189695-20120300-0019

慶應義塾大学学術情報リポジトリ(KOARA)に掲載されているコンテンツの著作権は、それぞれの著作者、学会または出版社/発行者に帰属し、その権利は著作権法によって保護されています。引用にあたっては、著作権法を遵守してご利用ください。

The copyrights of content available on the KeiO Associated Repository of Academic resources (KOARA) belong to the respective authors, academic societies, or publishers/issuers, and these rights are protected by the Japanese Copyright Act. When quoting the content, please follow the Japanese copyright act.

Power and Solidarity as Observed in the forms of Address/Reference in Japanese Political Discourse: Focusing on Selected Samples from the Minutes of the Diet (2001–2005) in BCCWJ

Angela A-Jeoung KIM

1. Introduction

The aim of this study is twofold. The first is to examine a general tendency regarding the use of forms of address/reference in the Japanese National Diet. The other is to examine how specific forms of address are used in particular circumstances to achieve peculiar goals, such as displaying power or solidarity in the political discourse. Parliamentary discourse is “ritualized and rule-bound; it is governed by tradition, rules and regulations and new Members are required to respect them. Naturally the rituals and rules observed change from nation to nation but they will all determine particular linguistic choices” (Bayley 2004: 14). With respect to forms of address, Bayley (2004: 14–15) goes on to note that members of parliament in the UK are not permitted to address their colleagues directly, but only the chair and this results in a frequent use of the first-person pronoun, and a low frequency of ‘you’ for spoken discourse (Bayley 2004:14). However, direct address is permitted in the Italian parliament and therefore Italians can choose from a variety of address terms (Bayley 2004: 14–15). As such, “although on a cross-cultural level parliaments fulfil broadly similar functions, they are sensitive to the context of culture and history in the widest sense” (Bayley 2004: 14) and thus, it is meaningful to examine the case of Japanese in the Japanese Diet as Japanese has distinct linguistic characteristics related to forms of address/reference.

2. Corpus

The corpus used for this study comprises the minutes of the Japanese Diet. The corpus is a part of the “Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written

Japanese” (hereafter BCCWJ) currently under limited release for monitoring purposes, by National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics¹. The BCCWJ contains 159 excerpts from the minutes of the Diet covering sessions of the National Diet from 1976 to 2005. The corpus is arranged chronologically and I have chosen to focus on the most recent session available, that of 2001 to 2005. The number of excerpts in this session is 30 (See 丸山 (2009a) and 丸山 (2009b) for details of the excerpts and sampling method for the corpus).

I note that the characteristics of spoken form in plenary sessions and committee meetings differ, since in plenary sessions the utterances produced are mainly reading from prepared notes (松田 他, 2008: 55) while in committee meetings that is not the case. 服部 (2011: 45–46) found that utterances found in committee meetings exhibited characteristics similar to those found in face-to-face conversations, while plenary sessions were awash with the use of the copular *~desu*. Furthermore, sentence final particles are extremely frequent in committee meetings and not in plenary sessions. Although insightful, and possibly a factor in variations of forms of address/reference, I will not make the distinction between the types of meetings in this study. This is because the composition and intent of plenary sessions and committee meetings are certainly quite distinct, yet the language of both belongs to the larger category of the language used in the Diet.

Minutes of parliamentary proceedings are used widely for linguistic analysis. The records of Hansard, the official record of the British parliament, are known to not record parliamentary utterances absolutely verbatim (Slembrouck 1992; Ilie 2001) as the characteristics of spoken language such as a lack of fluency, false starts, incomplete utterances and (un)filled pauses used by MPs are filtered out, and also informal language is changed into formal and standard English and so on (Slembrouck 1992: 104–106). If Hansard is considered as non-verbatim due to such modifications, the Japanese minutes of the Diet are also non-verbatim. As is the case with most parliaments, Japanese members of Diet are protected by Article 51 of the constitution which reads: “Members of both Houses shall not be held liable outside the House for speeches, debates or votes cast inside the House” (Hayes (2009: 298); http://www.shugiin.go.jp/index.nsf/html/index_kokkai.htm). Therefore, which utterances should be considered as ‘inappropriate remarks’ are difficult to determine (松

田 2008: 17). *Fukisoku hatsugen*, ‘irregular remarks’ or jeering, including rude or irrelevant remarks, are generally deleted from the minutes of the Diet (for details of how the minutes are prepared see 鈴木 (1994), for details of deletion of certain remarks from the minutes see 前田 (1997), and for details of modifications made see 松田 他. (2008)).

The minutes of the Japanese Diet are also available on the internet and there are questions regarding whether this data should be treated as spoken or written (松田 2008)、given that many of the characteristics of spoken language are modified as mentioned above. While the data used in this study is taken from the aforementioned corpus rather than the electronic version, the issues regarding whether to treat this kind of data as spoken or written remain (especially as the data used in this study is included in the corpus of ‘written Japanese’). While paying attention to the initial division of material into four types of orality in text, Oesterreicher (1997) mentions that “. . . an everyday conversation of two friends as *parlato parlato* and a legal document as *scritto scritto*. On the other hand, the delivery of a prepared paper would be a case of *scritto parlato*, and a letter to an intimate friend in an informal style could be classified, then, as *parlato scritto*.” (Oesterreicher 1997: 192). According to this division, readings of prepared papers in the Diet would be *scritto parlato*, while the interchange found in the committee meetings would be *parlato parlato*, which are different types orality, yet both can be classified as spoken material in a broader sense².

3. Background and method

Brown and Gilman (1960) claim that unless two people are equals, one person has power in a relationship, and the use of pronouns “expressing this power relationship is also asymmetrical or nonreciprocal” (Brown and Gilman 1960: 257). On the other hand, solidarity, of which like-mindedness is the core, is symmetrical and or reciprocal (Brown and Gilman 1960: 258). Such power and solidarity is well manipulated through linguistic choices in a political setting, and the strategic use of pronouns has significance as “politicians make use of pronouns to good effect: to indicate, accept, deny or distance themselves from responsibility for political action; to reveal ideological bias, to encourage solidarity; to designate and identify those who are supporters (with us) as well as those who are enemies (against us); and to present specific idiosyncratic

aspects of the individual politician's own personality" (Wilson 1990: 76). This means that politicians often use different terms for different purposes and their choices reflect "issues of identity, solidarity and persuasion and is considered an important strategy in helping politicians signal their involvement with their audience" (Bevitori 2004: 105). For example, 'I' is used to deliberately emphasize positive claims about their achievements, and to indicate individual responsibility (Wilson 1990: 51–52). Other examples of these manipulative uses of pronouns in political setting includes the strategic use of shift between inclusive and exclusive 'you' in the presidential debates between Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford in 1976 (Wilson 1990: 51–52), and Mrs Thatcher's use of 'they' to distance herself from a specific group (Wilson 1990: 67–68).

Japanese has a variety of choices to refer to the speaker, the addressee, and a third party (Hirose 2000: 1624) and they reflect relationships between speaker and hearer (Ide 1990: 43) as well as indicating interpersonal distance (滝浦 2008: 78–84). Especially with regard to the use of second person reference, it is possible to "tell something about the speaker's attitude and position vis-à-vis others" (Ide 1990:43). At the same time as having a variety of choices, Japanese personal pronouns, especially the first and second person pronouns, are "simply too loaded with semantic and pragmatic information" to be used impersonally (Kitagawa and Lehrer 1990: 756) and thus, instances such as an exclusive use of 'you' mentioned above are not expected in Japanese³.

To better understand the general tendency of the use of address/reference terms used in the Japanese Diet, I have extracted some possible pronominal address/reference terms as well as other nominal address/reference terms (institutional titles) which are appropriate for use in situations where pronominal address terms are inappropriate (金田一 1988: 166). Possible occurrence was assumed with respect to the fact that the forms of address/reference are specifically used in parliamentary discourse, a form of discourse which is restricted and rule-governed⁴. The forms have been selected in the light of the insights from Ilie (2010) outlined below, and a variety of personal pronouns noted in 金田一 (1988: 159–168) and Ishikawa et al. (1981).

While examining the case of British and Swedish parliamentary interaction, Ilie (2010: 890) denotes that nominal forms of address fall into the four categories (all the examples here are of the UK parliament): (i) a gender-

specific title (such as “the honourable lady” or “the honourable gentleman”); (ii) a gender-neutral title (such as “member” or “friend”); (iii) an institutional title (such as “speaker”, “prime minister”, “foreign secretary”); and (iv) a personal name. With respect to personal names Ilie (2010: 890) posits that both a first name and last name, only a first name, or only a last name could be used in the Swedish Riksdag, but that personal names are not used in the UK parliament, except for the occasional case where the speaker of the house uses it to address an individual MP.

In the case of Japanese, a ‘gender-specific title’ is unavailable; although how the speaker or president of the house, or a chairman of a committee, addresses an individual member of the Diet may vary depending on their gender (see 4–1 for details)⁵. ‘Gender-neutral titles’ includes *giin*, ‘member of the house’, *iin*, ‘member of the committee’, and *sensei(gata)*. *Sensei*, the literal meaning of which is ‘teacher’ or ‘professor’, is “used to address not only teachers but also people with socially prestigious occupations, such as doctors, lawyers and members of the Diet” (Ishikawa et al 1981: 138). ‘Institutional titles’ are of course present in Japanese and include, among others, the following: *naikaku soori daijin*, ‘prime minister’, *daijin*, ‘minister’, *iinchoo*, ‘a chairman of a committee’, and *gichoo*, ‘the speaker (president) of the house’. A ‘personal name’ is used only in combination with gender-neutral titles or institutional titles with last name or with the full name, but never the first name alone.

I first examined the number of occurrences of these terms using the search system ‘Himawari’, the local search engine within the corpus. The raw data given in the second column of Table 1 indicates these results. After extracting the number of occurrences, I narrowed these down by sorting according to a preceding character string. This is because the raw data not only contained the address/reference terms used in actual utterances but also contained the uses of them in transcribing for speaker identification. Also sorting the raw data by a proceeding character string helped eliminate the double count of words which have identical parts such as ‘私’ which includes ‘私たち’ and ‘私ども’ and so on. These are indicated as numbers in brackets in the table. Note that the numbers indicated in the third column, the ‘used in actual utterances’ category, contains not only terms of address but also terms of reference. This column also contains the use of address/reference terms not only by the

Table 1. Forms of address/reference found in the corpus Minutes of the Diet (2001–2005) in BCCWJ

Terms	Raw data	Used in actual utterances	Remarks
<i>daijin</i> (大臣), minister	2288	1504	
<i>giin</i> (議員), member of Diet	251	250	Column 2 includes 「議員選挙区」
<i>gichoo</i> (議長), speaker, president of the house	115	28	
<i>soori</i> (総理), prime minister	456	435	
<i>iin</i> (委員), member of committee	2777	765	Numbers in Column 2 includes terms such as 「委員会」 and 「委員視察」. Column 3 includes 「委員長」
<i>iinchoo</i> (委員長), chair of committee	(520)	(147)	Included in the number of 「委員」 above
~ <i>sensei</i> (先生), used for prestigious profession	546	546	Includes 「先生方」
~ <i>sensei-gata</i> (先生方), plural for <i>sensei</i>	(39)	(39)	Included in the number of 「先生」 above
~ <i>kun</i> (君), used to inferior	2391	447	
~ <i>sama</i> (様), roughly translated as Mr/Ms	402	126	Numbers in Column 2 includes terms such as 「様々」「様式」「様子」「様態」「一樣」「同様」「多様」 and 「態様」
~ <i>san</i> (さん), roughly translated as Mr/Ms	960	793	Numbers in Column 2 includes terms such as 「たくさん」「さんざん」 and 「ずさん」
<i>wata(ku)shi</i> (私), I	4055	4055	Includes 「私ども」「私たち」 and 「私自身」
<i>watashi-jishin</i> (私自身), I myself (literally)	(63)	(63)	Included in the number of 「私」 above
<i>wareware</i> (我々), we (more formal than <i>wata(ku)shi-tachi</i>)	270	270	
<i>wata(ku)shidomo</i> (私ども), we (more formal than <i>wata(ku)shi-tachi</i>)	(738)	(738)	Included in the number of 「私」 above
<i>wata(ku)shi-tachi</i> (私たち), we	(157)	(157)	Included in the number of 「私」 above
<i>boku</i> (僕), I (only used by male)	58	58	Includes 「僕ら」
<i>bokura</i> (僕ら), we (only used by male)	(5)	(5)	Included in the number of 「僕」 above
<i>anata</i> (あなた), second person pronoun	63	63	Includes 「あなた方」
<i>anatagata</i> (あなた方), plural of <i>anata</i> , more formal than <i>anata-tachi</i>	(16)	(16)	Included in the number of 「あなた」 above
<i>kare</i> (彼), third person pronoun for male	33	33	Includes 「彼ら」
<i>kanojo</i> (彼女), third person pronoun for female	3	3	All occurred as 「彼女たち」
<i>otaku</i> (お宅), second person pronoun	2	1	Column 2 includes お宅, meaning 'house'
<i>otaku</i> (おたく), second person pronoun	3	3	
<i>ore</i> (おれ), blunt first person pronoun used by male	23	8	Column 2 includes terms such as 「おれぽ」 and 「おれない」. Also 「おれ」 in 「おれおれ詐欺」
<i>omae</i> (おまえ), second person pronoun	8	8	

members of the Diet, but also by expert or unsworn witnesses who are not Diet members. However, I have included both without distinction since it is beyond the scope of this study and it does not change the fact that it is language used in the proceedings of the Diet. What should be noted here, therefore, is that the table should be understood as presenting a frequency (and thus, a tendency) of how often a specific term occurred in the corpus rather than indicating the absolute numbers of these terms used by and between the members of the Diet⁶.

Due to the limitations of space, I will focus on examining some of the specific use of forms of address/reference which have significance, rather than making a general statement about their usage in the corpus as a whole.

4. Terms of address/reference used in the parliamentary discourse

4-1 Conventionalized power

The speaker, or the president of the respective house is its leader (Baerwald 2010: 83) and has various formal powers over his chambers (Baerwald 2010: 86–87) as a presiding officer. Elected in each house and appointed by the respective presiding officer are committee chairmen in the Japanese Diet (Baerwald 2010: 94; Hayes 2009: 52). Committee chairmen also have “extensive formal powers governing the procedural operation of the committees” (Hayes 2009: 52). The formal powers include “disciplinary powers over his committee’s members, including ordering any member who engages in delinquent behavior (as defined by the chairman) to leave the room” (Baerwald 2010: 99–100). From this it is clear that whether it be *gichoo*, ‘the speaker or president’ or *iinchoo*, ‘committee chairman’, they have formal power over the members of the Diet during the proceedings. Their conventionalized use of the address terms such as *~kun*, to address members of the Diet could be considered a formal display of power. Example (1) shows that the chairman uses either last name or full name with *~kun* to address the committee members.

- (1) (国会会議録 第153回国会 2001衆議院 常任委員会 国土交通委員会 OM61_00011)

- 赤松委員長 古賀君、時間が終わりましたので、御容赦願いたいと思います。
- 古賀（一）委員 それでは、坂政策統括官の話は後ほど個別に聞かせていた

できます。これで終わります。

- 赤松委員長 山田正彦君。
- 山田（正）委員 自由党の山田正彦です。（省略）

Chairman Akamatsu: *Koga-kun*, pardon me but you have used up your time.

Committee-Member Koga: Then I will hear (the answers) from Saka *Seisaku-tookatsu-kan* (Saka, the Director-General for Policy Planning) later on. I have finished⁷.

Chairman Akamatsu: *Yamada Masahiko-kun*.

Member Yamada: (I am) Yamada Masahiko from the Liberal Democratic Party.
(omitted)

As mentioned earlier, a gender specific title is unavailable in Japanese, though gender can affect the form of a title to be used. Example (2) shows an instance of a chairman referring to male and female members of the Diet using different forms of reference, *~kun* and *~san*, respectively.

- (2) (国会会議録 第162回国会 2005 参議院 常任委員会 厚生労働委員会 OM65_00006)

- 委員長（岸宏一君） ただいまから厚生労働委員会を再開いたします。委員の異動について御報告いたします。本日、国井正幸君及び蓮舫さんが委員を辞任され、～（省略）。

Committee Chairman (Kishi Koichi): I hereby announce that we will resume the Committee Meeting on Health, Labour and Welfare. I inform you of some changes in personnel. *Kunii Masayuki-kun* and *Renho-san* have resigned from the committee and ～ (omitted).

A chairman uses *~san* not only to refer to a female member of the Diet but also to address a female member to indicate her turn to speak. Example (3) below shows a chairman addressing male and female members of the Diet, using a full name followed by *~kun* for the former and a full name followed by *~san* for the latter.

- (3) (国会会議録 第162回国会 2005 衆議院 常任委員会 法務委員会 OM61_00006)

- 塩崎委員長 質疑の申し出がありますので、順次これを許します。津川祥吾君。
- 津川委員 民主党の津川祥吾でございます。おはようございます。（省略）
- 塩崎委員長 次に、小林千代美さん。

○小林（千）委員 民主党の小林千代美です。（省略）

Chairman Shiozaki: There is a request for questions, and I allow this. *Tsugawa Shogo-kun*.

Member Tsugawa: (I am) Tsugawa Shogo from the Democratic Party. Good morning. (omitted)

Chairman Shiozaki: Next, *Kobayashi Chiyomi-san*.

Member Kobayashi: (I am) Kobayashi Chiyomi from the Democratic Party. (omitted)

Where this becomes worthy of further attention, however, is that it is NOT the case that female members of Diet are always addressed with/referred to by *~san*. Example (4) shows a female Diet member being addressed with *~kun* (with both surname and full name), in the same way male members were addressed in (1), (2) and (3).

(4) (国会会議録 第159回国会 2004 参議院 常任委員会 法務委員会 OM65_00005)

○委員長（山本保君）（省略）この際、千葉君から発言を求められておりますので、これを許します。千葉景子君。

○千葉景子君 私は、（省略）

Chairman (Yamamoto Tamotsu): (Omitted) There is a request to speak from *Chiba-kun* and I allow this. *Chiba keiko-kun*.

Chiba Keiko: I~ (omitted).

A chairman can use *~kun* when addressing a minister as well. Here, in example (5) *~kun* is used with both the full institutional title and the full name:

(5) (国会会議録 第159回国会 2004 参議院 常任委員会 議院運営委員会 OM65_00001)

○委員長（宮崎秀樹君）次に、厚生労働副大臣森英介君。

○副大臣（森英介君）中央社会保険医療協議会委員の公益を代表する委員の土田武史君は四月七日に任期満了となりますが、（省略）。

Chairman (Miyazaki Hideki): Subsequently, *koosei-roodoo-fukudaijin Mori Eisuke-kun* (the *Senior Vice-Minister for Health, Labour and Welfare, Mori Eisuke-kun*).

Senior Vice-Minister (Mori Eisuke): The term of office of Tsuchida Takeshi-kun, who represents the welfare of the members of Central Social Insurance Medical

Council, will expire on April 7～ (omitted).

In addition to the full institutional title and full name as in (5), the use of a surname with a full institutional title, or a surname with part of the institutional title is also found to be used when a chairman is addressing ministers. The former is presented in (6), and the latter in (7).

(6) (国会会議録 第153回国会 2001 参議院 常任委員会 財政金融委員会 OM65_00007)

- 委員長(山下八洲夫君) 次に、銀行法等の一部を改正する法律案を議題いたします。政府から趣旨説明を聴取いたします。なお、本案は衆議院において修正議決されましたので、この修正部分につきましてもあわせて政府から説明を聴取いたします。柳澤金融担当大臣。
- 国務大臣(柳澤伯夫君) ただいま議題となりました銀行法等の一部を改正する法律案につきまして、提案の理由及びその内容を御説明申し上げます。(省略)

Chairman (Yamashita Yasuo): Subsequently, we will discuss the legislative bill about a partial amendment of the Banking Act. We will hear the government's explanation of the objectives of the proposal. Further, this proposal has passed a vote with an amendment in the House of Representatives. Therefore, we will also hear the explanation of the government regarding the revised sections. *Yanagisawa kinyuu-tantoo-daijin (Minister for Financial Services Yanagisawa).*

Minister of State (Yanagisawa Hakuo): I will explain the reasons and contents of the proposal on the legislative bill regarding the partial amendment of the Banking Act, which has been brought up for discussion. (omitted)

(7) (国会会議録 第153回国会 2001 衆議院 常任委員会 国土交通委員会 OM61_00011)

- 赤松委員長 扇大臣。恐縮ですが、時間が終わっておりますので、簡潔にお願いします。
- 扇国務大臣 簡潔に言うには難しい問題ではございますけれども、(省略)

Chairman Akamatsu: *Oogi daijin (Minister Oogi).* I am sorry but the time is over so please be brief.

Minister of State Oogi: Although it is a difficult question to answer briefly, ～ (omitted).

Taking (6) and (7) together it could seem as if the chairman were addressing the ministers using a full institutional title on the first address (since in (7) the

minister had already used up her speaking time, which means that she had previously been addressed to speak). However, the context in which (6) was extracted showed that this was not the case as Minister Yanagisawa previously had been answering other questions. Thus, the chairman's choice of address (a full institutional title or a part of it in combination with the surname) do not depend on whether or not it is the first time a speaker in the Diet session is being addressed.

~*Kun* can also be used by the speaker when addressing the prime minister. (8) shows a case where ~*kun* is used with a full institutional title, *naikaku-soori-daijin*, 'prime minister' which is followed by the full name.

(8) (国会会議録 第162回国会 2005 衆議院 本会議 OM63_00002)

- 議長（河野洋平君）岡田克也君からさらに再質疑の申し出がありますので、これを許します。岡田克也君。内閣総理大臣から答弁を補足したいとのことであります。これを許します。内閣総理大臣小泉純一郎君。
- 内閣総理大臣（小泉純一郎君）各再質問項目の中で、岡田代表や民主党の御意見があったことは理解しております。（省略）

Speaker (Kono Yohei): Okada Katsuya-kun had further requested a re-interpellation and I will allow it. Okada Katsuya-kun. The Prime Minister wants to supplement (his) reply and I will allow it. *Naikaku-soori-daijin Koizumi Junichiro-kun (The Prime Minister Koizumi Junichiro-kun)*.

The Prime Minister (Koizumi Junichiro): I understand that the leader of the opposition Okada-daihyoo, and the Democratic Party had their opinion on each further question. (omitted)

The power relationship between the speaker and the prime minister may not be as straightforward as with other ministers or members of the Diet since “formally, the presiding officers of each chamber are its leaders. . . . however, it is the Prime Minister who controls the presiding officers of the Diet” (Baerwald 2010: 83). In spite of this, the fact that the convention allows the presiding officers to use ~*kun* to a prime minister implies their power in the governance of the Diet sessions. Apart from the use of ~*kun* for male members and ~*san* for female members at times, it seems that there are no specific rules about how institutional titles and names are combined as long as it is not the first name alone.

Not many instances of the vocative are found as address terms in spoken

discourse. For example, 227 vocatives are used by questioners toward question-answering ministers, and 13 vocatives are found to be used to committee chairmen (one of which is shown in (9) below). Interestingly, yet not surprisingly, no vocative use of *gichoo* was found. This may also be understood as a different characteristic between plenary sessions and committee meetings. Since the use of the vocative is to call someone directly, we can regard the use of it as a linguistic strategy employed by the speaker to create involvement by showing his/her own higher degree of personal involvement. This will have a specific impact on the interlocutor, as it clearly includes the interlocutor in the verbal frame (Arndt and Janney 1987:360). The involvement-inviting function of the use of vocative then explains absence of it in plenary sessions to the speaker or the president, as the prepared notes read in these sessions makes the utterance inherently detached.

- (9) (国会会議録 第156回国会 2003 衆議院 特別委員会 個人情報保護に関する特別委員会 OM62_00001)

○保坂委員 それでは、今の北海道の件について防衛庁でお調べいただくと思っていますから、明らかに違っていたという場合には、他のところも精査をして、当委員会にきちっと報告書を出し直していただくように、委員長、求めてください。

Member Hosaka (Nobuto, SDP): Then I will assume that the Defense Agency will investigate the case with Hokkaido. If there are any clear errors, *iinchoo* (*chairman*), please request (the government) to closely examine other areas and re-submit a report to this committee meeting.

In (9), Hosaka has been insisting at length that the data that was submitted by the government was incorrect. Similar to Ilie's (2010:897) observation on the use of vocative by the speaking member to the chairman, Hosaka's use of the vocative is to seek the chairman's "institutional assistance, permission and support" (Ilie 2010: 897) to request a re-submission of the report. In other words, it is used to directly appeal to the chairman, in his authoritative role which includes mediating and the regulating of interaction. Since the use of vocatives is not a common practice in the Japanese Diet (in comparison to, for example, the use of it in Swedish Riksdag in which the MPs always start their interventions by explicitly addressing the speaker first (Ilie 2010: 900)) any instance of use could be expected to draw attention and accordingly have a

strong impact.

4-2 Expressing solidarity

When referring to the same party member, the members of the Diet use a referring term such as *watakushi no too no ~ giin*, ‘member ~ who belongs to my party’. Explicit mention of ‘my (our) party’ could be considered as emphasizing solidarity between party members.

- (10) (国会会議録 第154回国会 2002 参議院 特別委員会 国会等の移転に関する特別委員会 OM66_00001)

○保坂三蔵君 (省略) 先ほど私の党の河本議員がお話がありました政経不可分の話。それから、今もお話がありました、東京都にとってなぜ首都が大事なのかと、こういうお話でしたが、私は全く河本先生がおっしゃったことの延長上の意見でございまして、首都の問題は東京都にとってどう大事かではなくて、東京が首都であることが日本の国にとってどう大事であるかという観点から私たちは論じてきたつもりなんです。(省略)

Hosaka Sanzo (LDP): (omitted) (on) the principle of inseparability between political and economic affairs, brought up a little ago by *watakushi no too no kawamoto giin* (*Kawamoto, a member of my party*) and also why it is important that Tokyo is the capital. My opinion is *exactly an extended version of what Kawamoto-sensei said*. What we believe we have been arguing is from a viewpoint of not how important it is for Tokyo to be the capital city. Rather, we believe that as *we* have been arguing from a viewpoint of how important it is for Japan to have Tokyo as the capital city. (Omitted)⁸

Before this example, Kawamoto Eisuke (LDP) had been asking questions of an unsworn witness, the Governor of Tokyo. Hosaka Sanzo who belongs to the same party as Kawamoto, records his topic of inquiry as ‘the problem mentioned by Kawamoto of my party (lit.)’. Hosaka observes that his opinion is an extended version of what Kawamoto had already expressed, which can be seen as emphasizing the party’s policy. Also the use of ‘we’ in ‘we have been arguing’ enhances solidarity as it clearly enunciates that it is the party’s policy that Hosaka wants to put forward.

Diet members also use *dooryoo giin*, ‘fellow Diet member(s)’ to emphasize their solidarity and like-mindedness, and as a clear indication of their membership in the same political party. A succinct example is (11):

- (11) (国会会議録 第162回国会 2005 参議院 常任委員会 厚生労働委員会 OM

65_00006)

- 坂本由紀子君 自由民主党、坂本由紀子でございます。(省略)。今日は、そのうちの特に厚生年金事業振興団につきまして状況を少しお伺いしたいと思います。先ほど同僚議員の質問に対して、これら施設の建設に一兆四千億円というお金をこれまで投じてきたという説明がございました。

Sakamoto Yukiko: (I am) Sakamoto Yukiko from the Liberal Democratic Party. (omitted). Today, (I am going to) ask questions focusing on the circumstances pertinent to the Employees' Pension Welfare Corporation. As an answer *to my fellow member's* question, there has been an explanation that fourteen trillion yen was spent on the construction of those facilities.

Before the excerpt in (11), Nakajima Mahito, and Nishijima Hidetoshi, both LDP members had been asking questions to unsworn government witnesses. In this excerpt, Sakamoto Yukiko, who also belongs to LDP, uses *dooryoo giin*, 'fellow Diet member' in *dooryoo giin no shitsumon*, 'the question asked by my fellow Diet member'. Contextually, the word *dooryoo*, 'fellow' is used by Sakamoto to refer to her fellow LDP member, Nakajima, who had previously asked about the spending on the construction of facilities.

Dooryoo giin, 'fellow Diet member(s)', however, can not only be used to indicate membership in the same political party, but can also be used in a broad and inclusive sense. When it is used in such a way, it is found to refer to every member of the Diet, irrespective of party affiliation. Such use is found in (12):

(12) (国会会議録 第151回国会 2001衆議院 本会議 OM63_00001)

- 日森文尋君 (省略) さて、機密費をめぐって、これは政官の裏金であり、国会対策や外遊のためのせんべつに使われている、だから、国会議員は与野党を問わず同罪なのだから徹底した追及はできないだろう、こんなことがまことしやかに語られていますが、これは全く恥ずべきことです。国会対策やらせんべつやら、もしそのようなあしき慣行があるのならば、きっぱりとやめればいいんです。きょうここに御出席の同僚議員の皆さん、いかがでしょう。

Himori Fumihiro (SDP): (omitted) Anyway, there are stories being told that a secret budget is a slush fund for government officials and that it is used for the Diet Affairs Committee or gift money for trips abroad. Members of the Diet are equally guilty in this, regardless of which party they belong to, and therefore, it is unlikely that they will be able to thoroughly pursue the issue. This (the fact that they are talking about the members of Diet in this way) is utterly disgraceful. If there is bad convention such as this we can simply stop the

practice. *Dooryoo giin no mina-san*, (*everyone of the fellow Diet member*) what do you, all who are attending this session today, think?

Himori Fumihiro is a member of Social Democratic Party. He is talking about what people (most likely the general public/media) are saying about Diet members as a whole, that they are considered as equally guilty. In (12), Himori addresses every Diet member, as he is trying to emphasize their common membership as Diet members, against people who are non-Diet members who are talking about them in a disgraceful way, to urge all the members to take action against wicked behaviour.

We have seen in (10) that *watakushi no too no ~ giin*, ‘member ~ who belongs to my party’ was used to refer to a member of the same party. To specify the affiliation of a specific member, who belongs to a different party from the speaking member, *~ too no ~ giin*, ‘member ~ of ~ party’ is used. Using one after another in a sequence, explicitly draws a line that indicates ‘they’ are not ‘us’. (13) clearly exemplifies this:

- (13) (国会会議録 第162回国会 2005 参議院 常任委員会 厚生労働委員会 OM 65_00006)

○柳澤光美君 民主党・新緑風会の柳澤光美でございます。(省略)。この問題は、実は三月三十日の衆議院の厚生労働委員会で自民党の御法川議員、それから私ども同僚の城島議員の方から厚生労働委員会で質問をさせていただいて議論をいただいております。

Yanagisawa Mitsuyoshi: (I am) Yanagisawa Mitsuyoshi from the DPJ shinryoku-fuukai faction. (Omitted) In fact, this issue has been discussed as it was brought up at the committee meeting of Health, Labour and Welfare in the House of Representatives on 30 March by *Jimintoo no Minorikawa giin* (*Minorikawa from LDP*), and also *watakushi-domo dooryoo no Jojima giin* (*our fellow member Jojima*).

Yanagisawa’s use of *Jimintoo no Minorikawa giin* ‘Minorikawa from LDP’, clearly separates Minorikawa from the DPJ, especially as it is followed by *watakushi-domo dooryoo no Jojima giin*, ‘our fellow member Jojima’. This example is of particular interest, since separating someone by indicating that ‘he is not one of us’ does not only exclude Minorikawa but at the same time, indicates that the two different groups (usually with different interests) have a

similar opinion against the government. Although sometimes it may be in a party's interest to separate themselves from other parties, at other times it may be useful strategy to emphasize that more people have the same opinion in order to point out or make clear that the opinion they are presenting is for the good of general public according to many members of the Diet. Thus, while this use of 'they' indicates that 'he is not one of us', at the same time it emphasizes their solidarity against the government as it indicates that both "we" and 'they' brought this up'. This, in turn, can be interpreted as a broader sense of 'we' (as 'they' are in alliance with 'us') especially from a third party's (in this case the government's) point of view.

4-3 Change of emotional state reflected in the choice of terms of address

Within the Japanese Diet it is common for a minister to refer to a member of the Diet as *sensei*. One of the examples is as following in (14):

- (14) (国会会議録 第153回国会 2001衆議院 常任委員会 国土交通委員会 OM 61_00011)

- 赤城委員 おはようございます。私は、特殊法人改革、特に道路公団関係について伺いたいと思います。(省略)
- 佐藤副大臣 赤城先生が今おっしゃるとおり、高速道路の整備というのは、日本全体の地域の発展に対して大きな目的を持ってやっておるわけでありです。(省略)

Akagi (Norihiko): Good morning. I would like to ask questions on the reform of corporations that enjoy a special semi-governmental status. (My questions will be) raised with the Japan Highway Public Corporation in mind. (Omitted)

Senior Vice-Minister Sato: As *Akagi-sensei* mentioned, (we are) doing our job on highway maintenance and improvement with an important objective that has to do with a development of areas within Japan as a whole. (Omitted)

Example such as (14) is not unusual in the corpus, and in fact, Diet members are called *sensei* (Ishikawa et al 1981: 138). Also Diet members address/refer to each other as *sensei* (see, for example, Hosaka's use of Kawamoto-*sensei* in (10)). Given that *sensei* is commonly used to address the members of the Diet, a context which contains a drastic change of address terms deserves close examination. According to Brown and Gilman (1960: 273) behavioural norms are "practices consistent within a group" and where the choice of a pronoun clearly violates a group norm, or even the customary practice of the speaker,

“the meaning of the act will be sought in some attitude or emotion of the speaker. It is as if the interpreter reasoned that variations of address between the same two persons must be caused by variations in their attitudes toward one another” (Brown and Gilman 1960: 273–274). Braun (1988: 24) also asserts that “whenever variation in address behavior is strong, the use of a certain form may give more information about the person of the speaker than about the addressee or the relationship between the two . . . an address variety is part of the voluntary or involuntary self-presentation of speakers”. In fact, the change of address terms can reveal how a speaker’s emotions can change in the course of dialogue. In example (15), this change of emotion (most likely annoyance in this case) is clearly indicated in the change of address terms. In (15) Sato Kenichiro from the Democratic Party is questioning the Minister of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Yatsu Yoshio⁹. It is interesting to see that at the beginning of the interaction between the two, the Minister Yatsu refers to Sato as *sensei* quite frequently (three times within two turns, <15–3> and <15–5>). Sato constantly uses *daijin*, ‘minister’ even after Minister Yatsu had changed his form of address to Sato. First, in <15–1> to <15–3>, Sato is constantly addressing the *daijin* in the third person as *Yatsu-daijin*, ‘Minister Yatsu’ (which is a common practice when referring to a minister) and Minister Yatsu addresses/refers to Sato as *sensei*.

(15) (国会会議録 第151回国会 2001 衆議院 常任委員会 農林水産委員会 OM 61_00009)

<15–1> 佐藤(謙)委員: 民主党の佐藤謙一郎です。(省略) まず、きょう冒頭に、環境問題に非常に造詣の深い谷津大臣に、この諫早干拓が生態系に及ぼす影響というものをどういうふうに考えておられるか、そして、今回のノリの不作ということに生態系の問題からどういうふうに関連づけて御説明いただけるか、まずお聞かせいただきたいと思います。

Sato: (I am) Sato Kenichiro from DPJ. To start with, I would like to ask *Yatsu-daijin (Minister Yatsu)* who has profound scholarship in environmental problems about what (he) thinks of the influence of the land reclamation of Isahaya on the ecosystem. Also how (he) would explain the bad crop of *nori* in relation to the issues of the ecosystem.

<15–2> 谷津国務大臣: 先生も専門的な立場から今の御質問であります、(省略: 背景と経緯の説明) そういう中で干拓事業というのが進められてきたということも、先生もこれは御案内だろうというふうに思うんです。それと、

生態系との関連でありますけれども、(省略)

Minister Yatsu: (I understand that) *sensei* (you) are asking this question from a specialist's point of view. (omitted: talking about the background, and how matters came to this point) The reclamation work has proceeded in such circumstances and *sensei*, I think that (you) have already been informed about this, and about the relevance to the ecosystem~ (omitted).

〈15-3〉佐藤(謙)委員: (省略: 予防原則という政治姿勢を持つべきだと主張) 今までの谷津大臣とのいろいろな議論の中で、谷津大臣はそうした考え方をお持ちのように私は感じておりましたが、その辺についてはどうでしょうか。

Sato: (Omitted: talks about policy, and says that the precautionary principle should be the political stance taken). In various discussions with you *Yatsu-daijin*, I felt that (you) *Yatsu-daijin* had similar thoughts. How about that (what would you say about this?).

〈15-4〉谷津国務大臣: 実は、先生の考え方とそんなに変わっていないんです。と申しますのは、この諫早の件につきましては、あそこの水門をあけるといふ考え方がありますね。(省略: 水門を開けるか開けないかという問題をめぐっての議論について) そういうものを考え合わせますと、やはりそういうふうなものを万全に調査して、そういう災害が起きないようにものを早くちゃんとしておかないと、あそこの水門もあけられないという状況もあるわけでありまして、第三者委員会で水門をあけてくれ、そして調査したいと言ったときに、これから調査をしましてあげますよなんて言ったら、一カ月も先になったら、何をやっているんだと、またおたくの方からは非難をするんじゃないですか。ですから、そういうことのないように、私どもは早くからそういう対応もしているということなんです。しかし、これをあけるか、あけないかということについては、調査の面において必要ということになってくるわけでありまして、そういうふうな第三者委員会が判断したならば、あけて調査することが必要だ、私はこういうふうに言っているわけでありまして。

Minister Yatsu: In fact, my way of thinking is not very different from *sensei*'s (your's). I note that, as you know, regarding the issues of land reclamation, there is a strand of thinking that suggests that the floodgates should be opened. (omitted: Talking about the pros and cons of opening the floodgates). Considering such things, (we) may not be able to open the floodgates unless all those problems are thoroughly researched, and (we) are prepared for any disasters that may ensue. If (we) say (we) will have to inspect it first, to see whether it is acceptable to open the floodgates when a third-party committee comes and asks (us) to do so, then that will take a month and *otaku no hoo* (your party) will

certainly criticize (us) for it. So, in order to prevent that, (we) have been preparing for just such a case. However, whether or not to open the floodgates depends on whether or not it is needed for the inspection, so if the third-party committee decides that (they) need to open it for an inspection, I am saying that (we) should do so.

In the middle of <15-4>, Minister Yatsu uses *otaku no hoo*, ‘your side (lit.)’ to refer to the DPJ, to which Sato belongs and which, at that time, was the opposition party. The minister uses *otaku no hoo* in the context of how the opposition party will criticize the government. When there is a choice of saying *Minshutoo* (DPJ) which would have been a more neutral way of referring to the party Sato belongs to, using *otaku no hoo* sounds as if the Minister is being sarcastic or even condescending. From <15-5> below, focus on Sato’s repeated use of タイムリミット、‘time limit’ which seems to become a keyword of his question and at the same time, later becomes as a trigger for the Minister’s annoyance.

<15-5> 佐藤(謙)委員：(省略) やはり我々が一番深刻に考えなくちゃいけないのは、ことしの秋のノリの芽つけというものは大事だろうと思うんですけども、そのタイムリミットというのはいつだとお考えですか。これは中間報告をするというふうに、中間報告を求めておられるわけですけども、このタイムリミットをお示してください。

Sato: (Omitted) Although the seeding of *nori* this autumn is quite important, what we should seriously think about is the *time limit* (of deciding when/whether to open the floodgates). When do (you) think it should be? (You) are asking people to submit an interim report, please indicate the *time limit* for it.

<15-6> 谷津国務大臣：ノリの網入れが十月ごろということは、実は漁業者の皆さんからも私も聞いております。しかし、その準備もあるということも聞いております。そういうことを考え合わせますと、できるだけ早く中間報告をしてもらわなければならぬということで、実はこの第三者委員会も、最初は十三年度からというふうに申しておったのでありますけれども、これも早めなけりゃいかぬということから、きのう、委員会のメンバーを決めていただきましたし、また三月の三日には第一回目のそういう委員会も開いていただいて、早くそういったものを出してもらうということで私どもはお願いをしているところであります。

Minister Yatsu: I have in fact, heard from the people from the fishery that the netting of *nori* is around October but (I) have also heard that there are

necessary preparations for it. Considering those factors, (we) need to get the interim report as soon as possible and so in fact, this third-party committee was initially going to be held from the year 2001, but because (we) had to hurry it up (we) decided on the members for the committee yesterday. Also, we have asked them to hold the first committee meeting on 3 March so that (we) can get the interim report submitted soon.

〈15-7〉 佐藤(謙)委員: そのタイムリミットを示していただきたいと思います。いや、きょうは僕はすべて大臣をお願いをしていることですので、大臣、お願いします。(谷津国務大臣「専門的なことだから、ちょっとわからないので」と呼ぶ) いや、大臣がやはりお答えいただきたいと思います。

Sato: That *time limit*, that's what (I) would like (you) to indicate. Yes, today I am asking *daijin* (you) everything, so *daijin*, please. (Minister Yatsu says '(I) cannot say because it is a specialized matter'). Yes, (I) would really like the answer from the *daijin*.

〈15-8〉 谷津国務大臣: おたくはいつだと思っていますか。

Minister Yatsu: When do *otaku* (*you*) think it is?

After 〈15-6〉, which is the answer from the minister, Sato in 〈15-7〉 repeats the same question about the time limit. The second use of *daijin* is in a vocative form, addressing the minister directly. Even after the minister's reluctance in specifying the time limit, and admitting that he cannot say as it is too specialized area for him to answer, Sato continues to demand the answer, which is a face-threatening act. After Sato's commitment of the FTA, Minister Yatsu in 〈15-8〉 uses *otaku*, 'you' (used "towards an unfamiliar party, in formal speech" (Maynard 2005: 180)) to address Sato. Using *otaku* when he had previously been addressing Sato as *sensei*, is a dramatic change, to the extent that it could even be considered as face-threatening. It is natural to think that Sato's remarks in 〈15-7〉 contributed to this. Sato's face-threatening question triggered the Minister to ask the same question back to Sato, but this time addressing him as *otaku*, rather than *sensei* as he had been at the beginning of the session before these apparent conflicts and face-threatening questions.

〈15-9〉 佐藤(謙)委員: 私は、今すぐにでもあけなければ間に合わないというふうに考えております。

Sato: I think (we) should open them immediately. Otherwise (we) won't make it on time.

〈15-10〉谷津国務大臣: すぐにあけるということになった場合に、災害が起こってもいいんですか、あの諫早湾の方の。そういうことがあるから、今、事前に私どもは調査をさせているんですよ、それでいつでもあけられるように。そのときになってすぐにあけられないような状況をつくってはいかぬと思うから、今からいろいろなシミュレーションをやっておいてほしいということ。私は一月ぐらい前にも命令しているんですよ。それと同時に、もう一方では、先生、長崎県なんかは、今、絶対あけちゃ悪いと言っているんですよ。そういうことも頭に入れながら、私は、第三者委員会があげてくれ、そして調査するんだと言ったら、私自身が長崎県に行って説得しなきゃならない、そういう立場にもあるということ。をひとつ御理解いただきたいんですよ。

Minister Yatsu: Had (we) opened them immediately, are (you) saying that it would be acceptable if something disastrous had happened to people at Isahaya Bay? *Because of* those problems, *let me tell you that*, we have been getting people to inspect them in advance. *So that* it is possible to open them at any time. *Let me tell you that* I have ordered people about a month ago to conduct various simulations so that (we) are not in a position where (we) cannot open the floodgates when they need to be opened. At the same time on the other hand, *sensei, let me tell you that* Nagasaki Prefecture says they shouldn't be opened at all. With all these things in mind, *let me tell you*, (I) want (you) to understand that I am in a position where if the third-party committee asks for the floodgates to be opened for an inspection, I will have to go and convince (people at) Nagasaki Prefecture.

〈15-11〉佐藤(謙)委員: それでは、谷津大臣、先ほどの私に対する質問と同じように、災害があつたらどうされるんですか。

Sato: Then *Yatsu-daijin* (as you have) asked me a little ago, what will (you) do if disaster happens?

〈15-12〉谷津国務大臣: ですから、そういう二次災害がある可能性がありますから、今、前につくられておる潮どめ堤があるんですよ。それは自動的に開閉できるようになっているんだそうです。ですから、そういうふうな面を、今機能するかどうか全部調べてほしいということも含めて、それから、六メーターも干満の差があるわけですから、そういう場合に秒速六メーターぐらいで水がなだれ込んでくるわけです、あるいは外へも出ていくわけですから、そういうときに何か破壊されるようなことがないかどうか、そういうことも含めて、実は建設された方も呼んでそういう機能を今調べているという状況であるということ。を御理解いただきたいんです。

Minister Yatsu: Yes, *as I said, because* there are possibilities of a secondary disaster, *let me tell you*, that there is a seawall that was built sometime ago. It is said that the seawall opens and closes automatically. *So* (we are inspecting) such things, including whether they are actually functioning or not. Also *because* it is the case that the difference between the high and low tides is 6 meters, this means that the water will pour in or out at 6 meters a second. *And so* (I) *do want* (you) to understand that at the moment (we) are inspecting the functions (of the seawall), in fact (we) have also called in the person who built it. (We) are doing this so that (we) can find out whether there is any danger of (the seawall) breaking when the tide comes in and out.

From <15-10> to <15-12> it is quite clearly shown that the Minister is trying to get a point across. This can be seen in the many uses of *~kara* as an explanatory particle, as well as in the repeated use of *~n desu* which expresses an assertive attitude (Maynard 2005: 370). Also the addition of *yo* to *~n desu* gives utterances an emphatic appeal (Maynard 2005: 291). *~N desu yo* is used four times in <15-10>. Another use of *~n desu yo* is used at the beginning of <15-12>. The added *yo* to an already assertive *~n desu* conveys “urgency and has the feeling of “I’m telling you, can’t you understand?” or “I’m telling you, please understand me”” (Maynard 2005: 291). For some reason, the Minister changes back to the address term *sensei* in <15-10>. However, this *sensei* is used as a vocative, possibly showing an attempt to redress his previous face-threatening act in using *otaku*, and at the same time demonstrating that he really wants Sato to understand what he is saying, and how difficult his position is.

<15-13> 佐藤(謙)委員: これは我々は、私どもの菅議員からもお話をしているように、干潮時にとにかく水門をあけて水を入れるということは、いざさかも災害とは無縁の話だろうと思います。そこで、今度の第三者委員会が、項目の中に水門をあけて調査しようと言われたら、大臣は調査をすと言っておられるわけですがけれども、それでは、災害に対して万全の備えをしてからでなければ、幾ら第三者委員会が水門をあけて調査しようとしても、おあけに出来ないということです。

Sato: What we think of this, as our fellow member Kan has also mentioned before, letting the water in when it is low tide is not at all related to disasters. And if the third-party committee says the floodgates need to be opened for an inspection, the *daijin* is saying that (he) will open them. But does it mean that there is a

chance that (you) may not open them if the preparation for the prevention of a possible disaster has not been completed?

〈15-14〉 谷津国務大臣：ですから、そういうことのないように、事前に全部調査してくれということを私は命令しているんです。そういうことですから。

Minister Yatsu: **As I said, I'm telling you** that I have already ordered people to inspect everything in advance so that there will be no such instance. *That is what I have been saying.*

〈15-15〉 佐藤(謙)委員：その命令の答えは、タイムリミットはいつになるんでしょうか。

Sato: The answer to (your) decree, what then is the *time limit*?

〈15-16〉 谷津国務大臣：私のところへもう二、三回説明に来ております。そういうことで、あと二、三、あそこを建設した会社も呼んで、水門の強度というんでしょうか、そういうものがどういふふうなものであるかということの報告はまだ受けていませんが、そういうことも今聞いておるということでありますから、そう遠い先ではないと思います。

Minister Yatsu: People have come to explain to me two or three times. So after another two or three times (we) will also call in the people from the construction company to see the strength of the floodgates. (We) haven't heard about this yet, but (we) have asked so it shouldn't be too long.

〈15-17〉 佐藤(謙)委員：そう遠くないということであれば、第三者委員会が中間報告をなるべく早めて出すということになれば、五月でも六月でも水門をあける用意はあるということですね。

Sato: If it won't be too long, and if the third-party committee submits the interim report rather soon, (you) are saying that (you) will be willing to open the floodgates even in May or June, right?

〈15-18〉 谷津国務大臣：あなた、何を言っているんですか。そんな遅くやろうと思っていないよ、私は。

Minister Yatsu: What are *anata* (you) talking about? It hadn't even occurred to me to leave it that long.

In 〈15-12〉, the Minister is trying to say that preparations are underway so that whenever the floodgates need to be opened, they can be. However, Sato interprets his answer as meaning that there will be a chance of them not being opened if preparations have not been completed. The Minister in 〈15-14〉 once

again uses *~n desu* and *desu kara*, ‘as I have been saying’, trying to make Sato understand the point of his argument. However, Sato insists on demanding an indication of time limit after the Minister’s answer. Sato interprets this as evasion and comes up with an answer himself, suggesting it would be May or June. In <15–18> the Minister shows his anger saying *nani o itte iru n desu ka* which is a rhetorical question, used when criticizing angrily (Maynard 2005: 223). The most important part is also the change of address term, this time to *anata*, which is even more face-threatening than *otaku*. *Anata* by itself in this setting is face-threatening enough, but with the phrases and style he used the address term with, makes it even more so. The abrupt change of style shown in *omotte inai*, ‘I’m not thinking’, the casual form of which the appropriate form (which has been constantly used up to this point) would have been the polite style, *omotte imasen*, ‘I’m not thinking’ also adds to the demonstration of his anger and change of emotional state. Further, *yo* contributes to convey a strong sense of annoyance.

<15–19> 佐藤(謙)委員: わかりました。いやいや、そういうことを聞き出したく、僕は質問をしたわけですが、ですから、今私はタイムリミットということを行っているので、すぐにでも出せるということですね。

Sato: Okay. Well, I asked the question to get such information, (I) mean, I am talking about the *time limit*, so (what you are saying is that) it is possible to get it out immediately if necessary, right?

<15–20> 松岡副大臣: 佐藤先生は、大臣ということで私はお呼びじゃないかもしれませんが、お聞きをして申し上げますが、私どもは、悪いですが、先生も環境は御専門に随分取り組んでこられたかもしれませんが、少なくとも専門家ではない、環境工学にしても何にしても。私どももそうです。したがって、調査委員会にありとあらゆる立場からの専門の先生方を網羅し、かつまた漁業者の代表も私どもは要望に応じまして全部網羅して、そしてそういう調査委員会のもとで本当にあけてやらなきゃだめだ、ではどうということが、あけ方も含めて必要か、そして今度は、災害の問題も含めて、工学的な専門の先生も入っておられるわけでありますから、その先生方がそういったあらゆる角度から検討されてあけるとなれば、それはすぐにでもあけられるような準備をしておくというのが今の大臣の答えであります。したがって、そういう準備に我々も入っておる、農林省として。だから、これは、調査委員会の先生方の求めに応じて私どもはすぐ即断できる態勢をとっておるということであります。

Senior Vice-Minister Matsuoka: *Sato-sensei* may not want to hear from me as (he)

wanted the *daijin* to answer, but if (I) may say, *we*, (I) am afraid, (I) am sure that *sensei* also must have profound knowledge on the environment, however, not to the extent of being an expert on environmental engineering and other related areas. *We* are the same. Therefore, (we) have experts in the inspection committee who could give in-depth advice from various standpoints. *We* have also included a representative from the fishing industry and heard their requests. What *daijin's answer* means is that (we) are preparing in advance to be able to open the floodgates when the inspection committee decides that they should be opened. (Our) preparation includes things like the prevention of disaster, and a specific way of opening the gates. So *we, as the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries*, have been taking a part in such preparations. So *we* are preparing ourselves to be able to make an immediate decision upon the request of the experts in the inspection committee.

In <15–20> the Senior Vice-Minister's attempt to redress the face-threatening act done by the Minister can be seen from the use of *sensei* to Sato. While addressing Sato as *sensei*, at the same time, the Senior-Vice Minister points out that Sato is not an expert on anything even if he may have profound knowledge on many issues. He then establishes the solidarity that they (Sato and the government) are the same in that regard. The Senior Vice-Minister provides supports for the Minister's answer and their position as Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries by constantly emphasizing 'we', using *ware ware* once, and *watakushi-domo* four times. Such use of first person address terms would have sounded superfluous in Japanese had it not been in a context as this one where providing support for his teammate is done by emphasizing solidarity.

5. Concluding remarks

After a brief outline of the general tendency regarding the use of forms of address/reference in the Japanese National Diet, the current study examined power and solidarity observed through specific uses of the terms of address/reference. It was found that *~kun* was used with a full/part of institutional title or with full/surname to address/refer to both male and female Diet members. For female members, *~san* was also found to be used. To address/refer to the same party member, *watakushi no too no ~giin/watakushi domo no ~giin* were used. When referring to the members from other parties, *~too no*

~*giin* was used. *Dooryoo giin* was used to address/refer to either the members from the same party or different party. The interpretation depends on the context. The study also showed changes in the choice of address/reference terms towards the same addressee from *sensei* to *otaku* to *anata*. It clearly revealed an intertwined use of address terms with face-threatening acts and also with a change of emotions and the attitude of the speaker. It was also demonstrated that different terms of address can be employed as a strategy to redress FTAs already enunciated. Used to express power and solidarity, address/reference terms can also be used as effective devices to convey the feelings of the speaker. Employing forms of address/reference as such a device seems especially efficacious in the Japanese setting in which a rich variety of semantically loaded address/reference terms are available to serve distinct purposes.

Notes

- ¹ 「現代日本語書き言葉均衡コーパス」モニター公開データ（2009年度版）」国立国語研究所。
- ² I would like to thank Dr. Jamie Greenbaum for pointing this out and kindly directing me to the useful reference.
- ³ See Russell (1981) especially for a sociolinguistic analysis of the second-person pronouns in Japanese.
- ⁴ Some of the entries such as おれ and おまえ are added later as they occurred while examining the data. Not surprisingly, none of these terms are used, to refer to the speaker himself for the former, or to address someone present for the latter, but used in indirect speech.
- ⁵ Baerwald (2010: 76–77) observes that there is some confusion in the English terminology regarding the proper translation of *gichoo* (literally, chairman of chamber) since it is translated as ‘President’ in the case of House of Councillors while ‘Speaker’ is used in the case of House of Representatives. I have also confirmed this on the Japanese and English official websites of both houses (See the reference section for the details of these websites). Therefore, I will use the English terms as they are used in the respective Houses to refer to *gichoo*.
- ⁶ The table is presented here in order to observe the power and solidarity expressed by a use of forms of address/reference, it was inevitable to first draw out the frequency of specific terms used which, at the same time, shows the general tendency of which terms of address/reference are used in the Diet proceedings. Terms such as *kochira*, ‘here/first person pronoun’, and *sochira*, ‘there/second person pronoun’ were also

found. *Anata-tachi*, the plural form of *anata* was not used at all, but instead, a more formal form *anata-gata* was used.

⁷ The following website was consulted for English translation of the government organizations and positions: <http://www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/hourei/name.pdf>

⁸ Although I will not discuss it in this paper, it is interesting here to see that Kawamoto was referred as both *watakushi no too no kawamoto giin* as well as *kawamoto-sensei*.

⁹ I have modified the speaker turn ⟨B⟩ in the original corpus as ⟨15-number⟩ in order to refer to a particular section of the example without confusion. Except for the (省略: 内容) (omitted: contents) sections, all the dialogues are presented as they are, and according to their order in the corpus. As with all the other examples, the English translations are mine.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Professor Minori Murata for introducing me to the invaluable corpus. I would also like to thank Dr. Jamie Greenbaum for reading through this paper and providing insightful comments. However, any errors herein are mine.

References

- Arndt, Horst and Richard Wayne Janney. 1987. *InterGrammar: Toward an Integrated Model of Verbal, Prosodic and Kinesic Choices in Speech*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Baerwald, Hans H. 2010. *Japan's Parliament: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1974).
- Bayley, Paul. 2004. Introduction. In Paul Bayley (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–44.
- Bevitori, Cinzia. 2004. Negotiating Conflict. In Paul Bayley (ed.) *Cross-Cultural Perspectives on Parliamentary Discourse*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 87–109.
- Braun, Friederike. 1988. *Terms of Address: Problems of Patterns and Usage in Various Language and Cultures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Brown, Roger and Albert Gilman. 1960. The pronouns of power and solidarity. In Thomas A. Sebeok (ed.) *Style in Language*. Cambridge, Mass: The Technology Press of MIT and John Wiley & Sons, 253–276.
- Hayes, Louis D. 2009. *Introduction to Japanese Politics*. Fifth edition. New York: M. E. Sharpe.
- Hirose, Yukio. 2000. Public and private self as two aspects of the speaker: A contrastive study of Japanese and English. *Journal of Pragmatics* 32: 1623–1656.

- Ide, Sachiko. 1990. Person references of Japanese and American children. In Sachiko Ide and Naomi Hanaoka McGloin (eds.) *Aspects of Japanese Women's Language*. Tokyo: Kurosio, 43–61.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 2001. Unparliamentary language: Insults as cognitive forms of ideological confrontation. In René Dirven, Roslyn Frank and Cornelia Ilie (eds.) *Language and Ideology*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 235–263.
- Ilie, Cornelia. 2010. Strategic uses of parliamentary forms of address: The case of U.K. Parliament and the Swedish Riksdag. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42: 885–911.
- Ishikawa, Akira. et al. 1981. Address terms in modern Japanese: A sociolinguistic analysis. *Sophia Linguistica* 8/9: 129–140.
- Kitagawa, Chisato and Adrienne Lehrer. 1990. Impersonal uses of personal pronouns. *Journal of Pragmatics* 14: 739–759.
- Maynard, Senko K. 2005. *Expressive Japanese: A Reference Guide to Sharing Emotion and Empathy*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Oesterreicher, Wulf. 1997. Types of orality in text. In Egbert Bakker and Ahuvia Kahane (eds.) *Written Voices, Spoken Signs—Tradition, Performance, and the Epic Text*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 190–214.
- Russell, Harriet. 1981. Second person pronouns in Japanese. *Sophia Linguistica* 8/9: 116–128.
- Slembrouck, Stef. 1992. The parliamentary Hansard 'verbatim' report: The written construction of spoken discourse. *Language and Literature* 1 (2): 101–119.
- Wilson, John. 1990. *Politically Speaking: The Pragmatic Analysis of Political Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- 金田一春彦 (1988) 『日本語 (下)』 岩波書店.
- 鈴木悌夫 (1994) 「国会会議録作成の実務と課題」『議会政治研究』 30: pp. 70–78.
- 滝浦真人 (2008) 『ポライトネス入門』 研究社.
- 服部 匡 (2011) 「言語資料としての国会会議録の特徴 (1)—本会議と委員会等との比較」『日本語日本文学』 33: pp. 39–49.
- 前田英昭 (1997) 「国会の不穏当な発言と会議録の削除」『議会政治研究』 43: pp. 1–13.
- 松田謙次郎 (2008) 「第 1 章 国会会議録検索システム総論」『国会会議録を使った日本語研究』 松田謙次郎編、pp. 1–32. ひつじ書房.
- 松田謙次郎 他. (2008) 「第 2 章 国会会議録はどれほど発言に忠実か?—一文の実態を探る—」『国会会議録を使った日本語研究』 松田謙次郎編、pp. 33–62. ひつじ書房.
- 丸山岳彦 (2009a) 「サンプリング方法について」『現代日本語書き言葉均衡コーパス』 モニター公開データ (2009 年度版) pp. 1–17.
- 丸山岳彦 (2009b) 「書誌情報・サンプル情報・著者情報について」『現代日本語書き言葉均衡コーパス』 モニター公開データ (2009 年度版) pp. 1–34.

Websites

http://www.shugiin.go.jp/index.nsf/html/index_kokkai.htm (accessed on 2012/1/1)

Various contents within the following websites were consulted during December 2011 and January 2012:

Japanese Website of the House of Representatives <http://www.shugiin.go.jp/index.nsf/html/index.htm>

English Website of the House of Representatives http://www.shugiin.go.jp/index.nsf/html/index_e.htm

Japanese Website of the House of Councillors <http://www.sangiin.go.jp/>

English Website of the House of Councillors <http://www.sangiin.go.jp/eng/index.htm>

The Cabinet Office <http://www.cao.go.jp/en/minister/index.html>

<http://www.cas.go.jp/jp/seisaku/hourei/name.pdf>