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Abstract of Thesis

In the thesis I test the hypothesis that Late Old Japanese (LOJ) is not, as has been claimed by a number of scholars, a language that is innately “vague”, but that it is capable of conveying meaning clearly. To prove this I analyse the text of the *Genji Monogatari* in a number of ways.

I study the usage of honorifics in the text and the relationship between honorific usage and court rank. I show that honorific usage very often obviates the need for grammatical subjects and objects, and where honorifics or the context are not sufficient, the author introduces subjects to clarify the meaning of the text. Furthermore, I demonstrate that over brief sections of text, one character might be “tagged” with a particular honorific in order to identify them.

Status at the Heian court was determined by court rank, and the higher a person’s rank, the more honorifics had to be used. I investigate how characters could be identified when several people of similar ranks interacted. This will show that use by the author of the category of *theme* as well as occasional subjects serves to identify characters.

I examine the applicability of the phenomenon of switch reference to LOJ, attempting to determine how far it may have enabled the omission of grammatical subjects, and where LOJ presents problems for the canonical account of switch reference.

I examine syntactic differences between narrative and quotation, and excerpts where there are differences over where quotations begin, and cases where different characters’ quotations follow each other directly with no overt marking to separate them.

Finally, I study personal reference, covering the link between characters’ sobriquets and the type of scene in which they are appearing, and the usage of personal pronouns and demonstratives in the text.
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Note on Romanisation

The system of Romanisation used in this thesis for modern Japanese is the British Standard Specification for the Romanisation of Japanese (British Standard No. 4812, 1972). This is only a slightly modified version of the “Hepburn System”.

Due to the lack of any standard system for the Romanisation of Late Old Japanese (LOJ), the author’s own system is used for LOJ extracts and words throughout the thesis. This is broadly based upon the system used in Miller, Roy Andrew (1986) Nihongo: In Defense of Japanese Athlone Press, but with a few minor differences that should not cause any problems.

Note on Text Conventions

Throughout the thesis chapter titles from the Genji Monogatari have been Romanised as they are pronounced in modern Japanese and written with italics. Thus, Yūgao and not YuFugaFo. Similarly, when characters are discussed by “name”, Romanisations are given according to the modern pronunciation. Thus, “Rokujō” and not “Rokuju”. Throughout the thesis “they/them” has been used if a pronoun of indefinite reference is required, instead of the more conventional “he/him”.

Japanese names are given in the Japanese order, with surname followed by given name, throughout the thesis.

Where Japanese language material is used, the original is given first, followed by a Romanised version and then a translation. Where reference is made to Japanese language works in footnotes, the original text title is given on the occasion of the first reference, but thereafter Romanisation is used.
Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 The Tale of Genji

The *Genji Monogatari* (源氏物語) was written at the court of Heian Japan almost a thousand years ago by a lady-in-waiting whose name has come down to us as Murasaki Shikibu, which is a title derived from the court position held by her father and the name of one of the characters in the *Genji* itself. It is a lengthy work, fully two-thirds the length of the longest novel ever written, Proust's *A la Recherche de Temps Perdu*, and its plot tells of the life and loves of a Heian nobleman, Genji (源氏), known as Fikaru kimi (光る君) the Shining Prince, who is the epitome of all the characteristics that make up a perfect court noble. The plot continues after Genji's death with the story of his descendants and ends on an ambiguous note that has led to suspicion that the text as we have it is not complete.

The novel has been described as a romance, but if that were all it is then it is unlikely that it could be described as:

...the greatest achievement not only of Heian culture, but indeed of Japanese literature as a whole.¹

The whole question of the reception of, and the various interpretations that have been placed upon the *Genji*, is a fascinating subject for study in its own right, and cannot be addressed properly here. Briefly though, the novel has strong overtones of Buddhist morality about it. Genji the man loses his mother as a child and spends his entire life looking for her replacement in his many lovers. He falls in love with and seduces his father's Empress, Fujitsubo (藤壇), and has a child by her, whom the court believes to be the Emperor's legitimate son. His greatest love, Murasaki no Ue (紫上), is chosen for her resemblance to Fujitsubo, who in turn resembles Genji's mother. Genji's

greatest quality, and his greatest flaw, is his passion, which he can not control, and so inflicts suffering on all the women with whom he has any sexual relations, either by making advances when they are not wanted, or by neglecting old lovers for new. This emphasises the Buddhist message that desire is the root of all suffering. The novel also contains the notion of karmic retribution, as when Genji is middle-aged, his youngest wife, Jo San no Miya (女三宮), is seduced by a young noble, Kashiwagi (柏木), and conceives a son. Thus Genji has inflicted on him what he inflicted upon his father, although his suffering is made more evident as he discovers the affair and is well aware that his supposed child is not his own.

After Genji’s death the narrator announces that no one can take his place and it is true. The two male protagonists Kaoru, Kashiwagi’s son whom everyone believes to be Genji’s, and Niou, Genji’s grandson, move through the plot like pale copies of their predecessor, with none of his grandeur and little of his humour and compassion.

There is truly a sense that the world is gradually degenerating from light into darkness, another Buddhist tenet. The characters’ names express the idea most poetically. Genji is Fikaru kimi, the “Shining Prince”, but kaoru (薰) means “fragrance” and niFoFu (匳) “perfume”, thus we go from Genji’s light to something as feeble as a pair of odours, although Murasaki Shikibu makes much of the fact that Kaoru’s fragrance is his own natural one, while Niou goes to extravagant lengths in order to perfume himself to match his rival.

The novel pays great attention to describing the characters’ emotional states in minute detail. This sets it above the ordinary run of literature at the time and, in the opinion of some, considering the scope of the work, all Japanese literature since,
making it the crowning pinnacle of the writer's art in Japanese. Whether this view is justified or not is not the concern of this thesis, which lies with the nature of the language that was used to write the *Genji*, Classical Japanese, or more accurately, that dialect of Classical Japanese spoken and written by the Heian nobility at the beginning of the eleventh century, as the term Classical Japanese is generally considered to cover all forms of the language, from the earliest written record until the Meiji Restoration in 1868. Moreover, dialects spoken by the common people and the gentry elsewhere in Japan, were sometimes quite different from the speech of the imperial court, and were looked down upon as countrified and uncouth.

1.1 Aristocratic Society in Heian-Kyō

The Heian period is generally held to last from the end of the eighth century A.D., until the establishment of the Kamakura shogunate in the late twelfth. Of course, any society will change over such a long period of time, and the story of Heian-Kyō is a tale of the gradual loss of imperial power to the Fujiwara clan and then the loss of that power to the military clans in the provinces. In the section of this period that concerns us, the very end of the tenth century and the beginning of the eleventh, Fujiwara power was seemingly at its height, but already there were signs of the inevitable decay of aristocratic power, and the marginalisation of court life.

On the surface, though, life for the aristocracy in the capital was prosperous and comfortable. As a result of the Fujiwara usurpation of political power, positions in the imperial government carried no real responsibilities and were mainly sought after for the status they conferred in aristocratic society. In addition, the higher the position a man achieved, the more likely it was that he would be promoted to the higher court ranks. Such rank was all important to the aristocrats of Heian-Kyō, bringing with it as it did grants of land, servants and varying amounts of relief from

---

1 For a more detailed discussion of the themes involved in the *Genji*, as well as a more detailed introduction see Bowring (1988) pp22-50. See also Konishi (1986).
2 See section 1.3 for more details on the divisions of Japanese language history.
3 See Section 1.3.1 for a brief discussion of Classical Japanese dialects.
taxation, as well as the right to wear the more gaudy colours during attendance at court. Even when the imperial government was in control of the country, wealth derived from rank rather than from the actual position held, with the result that many nobles held more than one job. Although the system was originally based upon the Chinese one, very early on all ideas about promotion being based upon merit had disappeared, and the most important factor was one’s family connections. Naturally enough, as the Fujiwara had a monopoly of political power, they tended to monopolise the highest ranks as well, but there were still pickings available for the other families. The number of people able to hold court rank was still minuscule though, as the law allowed for about 1100 people, which was approximately one tenth of one per cent of Japan’s population at the time.¹ This then was the world of the Genji Monogatari and many of the other Japanese classics, a world that did its best to isolate itself from, not only other countries, but the rest of Japan as well.

As was stated above, the Heian nobility often had time on their hands due to their lack of any real political responsibilities and it is to their credit that this free time was more often than not turned to cultural and literary pursuits. Sir George Sansom has described their society as being governed by a “rule of taste”² and it is within this society that we must look for clues to understanding the nature of its language. Commenting on aristocratic life, Sansom calls it:

...a mode of existence dedicated to the acute perception of beauty and the refinement of personal relations to such a point that ideas and feelings could be conveyed by the merest shadow of a hint.³

The society of Heian-Kyō was so small and isolated that it is likely that almost anyone who was anyone knew everybody else. In such a small group, information can easily be conveyed by hints and suggestions that to an outsider would be all but incomprehensible. This was the target audience of the Genji.

² Sansom, George (1958) A History of Japan to 1334 Cresset Press, p179
³ Sansom (1958) p194
Examples of that audience’s isolation and contempt for anyone not in their immediate circle can be found in the *Genji* itself. In *Otome*, Genji’s son Yūgiri has his matriculation ceremony at the capital’s Confucian university. The academics are portrayed as comic, fusty characters and Murasaki Shikibu clearly describes the courtiers’ laughter at these strange creatures.¹ These were men, it must be remembered, who also would have had no contact with the provinces and lived all their lives in the capital, but they were of far lower rank and so were strange and alien. The nobility was isolated, even within the capital itself.

A further example comes in *Tamakazura* where Tamakazura is courted by a provincial noble from Higo. He is described as a great warrior who also believes himself to be cultured, and attempts to prove it with poetry. To Western eyes, such a character might seem to be rather dashing and heroic. Not, however, to the Heian court, as his attempts are described in such a way as to make them seem comic.² The underlying message is very clear; the only place worth being is in the capital; here is where real culture and refinement are to be found. This in spite of the fact that it was these provincial estates that provided the capital’s wealth, and warriors such as the Higo man who provided its security.

1.2 Heian Writing

The Japanese gained many of their initial ideas about government, culture and religion from contact with Imperial China on the mainland, and the language in which this knowledge was passed on was, of course, for the most part Chinese, more specifically written Chinese, it being easier to bring back books than people. Before this contact it is generally considered that the Japanese had possessed no writing system of their own, although some Japanese scholars have argued for the existence of *jindai moji* (神代文字) a “God Age Script”, whose use pre-dated the introduction of the Chinese writing system. The evidence for the existence of such a script is

² This incident is described in Imaizumi et al (1976) pp442-445 and Seidensticker (1981) p391, but see Endnote 2 for an excerpt from and partial translation of this section.
sketchy at best and even the earliest versions have signs for a smaller number of
syllables than are known to have been present in Old Japanese. Thus it seems most
likely that the “God Age” script was fabricated for nationalist reasons at a later stage
in history. Consequently, one can say that the Japanese were first exposed to writing
through the Chinese script, and be fairly confident that one is correct. The whole idea
of being able to write down words and ideas must have struck them as being rather
novel and within a relatively short time efforts had been made to use the Chinese
writing system to express Japanese.

The Chinese writing system, however, had been developing and changing for
centuries prior to the Japanese being exposed to it. Originally, it probably operated
upon logographic principles, that is that each character represented a word of the
language and not any particular group of sounds. By the fifth century AD, however, it
would be more accurate to describe the writing system as morphographic, with each
character representing a single morpheme, rather than a word and this is still the case
today. In any case, whatever the exact nature of the script, it is entirely possible for
the same character to have several different pronunciations depending upon when and
where it was written, although the meaning would remain the same. In any one time
and place, though, each character has one unchanging pronunciation. Consequently,
the Chinese writing system is suited to writing down Chinese, which is an uninflected
language. It is, however, completely unsuited to the Japanese language, which is
highly inflected. As particles and affixes for tense and modality did not exist in Old
Chinese there was no way of representing them graphically; without such things,
however, a piece of Japanese would be incomprehensible. In Japan to circumvent this
problem, some characters came to be used phonetically, that is for the sounds of the
words they represented and not the words’ meanings. Generally speaking, phonetic
readings of characters were derived from their Chinese pronunciation or at least a
Japanese approximation of it. Other characters began to be used as translation

---

moji.
equivalents for native Japanese words and the result was an immensely complicated system with some characters being used to represent words of various sorts and others being used purely as phonetic symbols. Gradually, abbreviated versions of the phonetic characters came into use. These abbreviated versions eventually developed into katakana (片仮名), while cursivised versions of other characters developed into hiragana (平仮名).

Originally, phonetic characters were necessary to add glosses and explanations to Chinese texts to allow Japanese readers to understand them. Eventually, a style of reading called kundoku (訓讀) evolved, which involved reading Chinese as if it were Japanese. A number of diacritic marks, okototen (平古止点), placed around the kanji or even on top of them, were used to indicate the presence of Japanese particles and the correct Japanese sentence order. Katakana continued to be used to provide readings for characters, while hiragana gradually stopped being used for this purpose. The Heian court continued to produce supposedly Chinese language works, in the form of imperial proclamations and mens’ diaries, long after all contact with China had been severed and, naturally enough, such works differ from real Chinese quite considerably. It is thus possible to make a distinction between true Chinese, kanbun (漢文), and the works produced in Japan, hentai kanbun (變態漢文), “anomalous kanbun”.

Native Japanese, on the other hand, used in private letters, notes and the like, came to be written in hiragana, which had acquired value as a means of expressing a writer’s character and aesthetic sensibility. Considering that the sexes had very little direct contact, a fine hand was particularly important for creating a good first impression when beginning an affair and much of Genji’s success in this area is due to his perfect handwriting.

Thus, we can identify three different styles of writing in use at the Heian court: the first one used in “private” life and the second two for “public”:

1. hiraganabun
2. Hiragana works

---

1 Also called 和文 (waibun), ‘Japanese language works’.
It is worth noting that the *kundoku* style of reading *kanbun* as if it were Japanese produced language that was different in a number of ways from the Japanese used in *hiraganabun* and so it is almost possible to say that there were two distinct literary variants of Heian Japanese. In fact, *hiraganabun* can be subdivided into *wabun* (和文), prose, and *waka* (和歌), poetry, and there were a number of differences here as well.

The differences fall into two major areas. First, there is the area of grammar, particularly honorific (*keigo*) usage. In *wabun* it was possible to make an honorific distinction by using the honorific auxiliary *tamaFu* on its own or in conjunction with the other auxiliary (*sa)su, *kanbun*, however, used only *tamaFu* and from the Heian period *keigo* stopped being used in poetry at all.

Second, there is the area of vocabulary, and it is here that the differences were perhaps most pronounced. There were whole sets of words or constructions that belonged clearly to either the *wabun* or *kanbun* traditions, of which the following are only a few examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kanbun</th>
<th>Wabun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gotosi -simu</td>
<td>yaunari -su/sasu</td>
<td>seem to be cause to (do)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adafazu</td>
<td>e....zu</td>
<td>be unable to (do)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kotonakare</td>
<td>na.....so</td>
<td>Don't (do)!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-zusite</td>
<td>-de</td>
<td>without (doing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sika</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>in that way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we turn our attention to Heian *wabun* works we find numbers of diaries, copious amounts of poetry and jottings of other sorts, in which the *Genji* stands like a colossus, remarkable not only for its length, but also the sophistication of its language and characterisation. Many of the works that are recognised now as having literary merit, were written by women. *Kagerō Nikki* (畔歳日記), *Sarashina Nikki* (更級日記), *Makura no Sōshi* (枕の草紙), *Genji Monogatari* and *Eiga Monogatari* (栄華物語).

---

1. Taken from 松村明 (1972) 国語史概説, 132頁 (Matsunura Akira (1972) Kokugo Shi Geijutsu, p132).
all were written by women in their native language. The only corresponding work by a man is Tosa Nikki (土佐日記), written by Ki no Tsurayuki the poet, who felt it necessary to maintain the fiction that he was a woman throughout, because at the time custom had it that men wrote their diaries in kanbun, and used them for fairly straightforward records of court events, making them “public” material, unlike the women’s diaries, which were much more personal. It is most likely that literary works such as those mentioned above were written largely in hiragana, but as the original manuscripts have not survived it is impossible to be certain, but the Heian word for hiragana, wonna-de (女手), “women’s hand”, suggests that this was the case. This is not to suggest either that only women used hiragana or that they never wrote anything else. In fact we have evidence to the contrary from Murasaki Shikibu herself as has been noted elsewhere. When writing about Sei Shōnagon she says:

Even the Chinese characters she writes and scatters about, when one looks at them closely, still leave much to be desired.

Notwithstanding what has been said above about the clear differences between wabun and kanbun, it is certainly true to say that by the time of the Genji, kundoku words and expressions had begun to appear in wabun works. It is not clear to what extent, however, they were thought of as alien intruders into a Japanese environment, and how far they had already become Japanese words. The likelihood is, however, that as the two types were still fairly distinct, when wabun authors used kanbun words or expressions they were aiming to create particular effects, such as making associations with particular kanbun poems and so on, for example. One very clear example of kanbun being used for effect comes in the aforementioned incident in

---

1 Translated into English as 'The Gossamer Years' by Edward G. Seidensticker; As I Crossed a Bridge of Dreams by Ivan Morris; The Pillow Book of Sei Shōnagon by Ivan Morris; The Tale of Genji by Arthur Waley (1926) and Edward G. Seidensticker (1981); and A Tale of Flowering Fortune by William H McCollough and Helen C. McCollough.

2 Seeley, Christophher (1991) p78

Otome, where Yūgiri matriculates at the Confucian university. The scholars use a number of kanbun words and constructions in their speech, which is plainly meant to make them seem crusty and old-fashioned.¹

¹ See 梅島裕 (1963) 平安時代の漢文通語についての研究. 東京大学出版會. pp771–796) for a more detailed discussion of the influences of kanbun on wabun.
1.3 The Syntax of Classical Japanese

Throughout this thesis a distinction is made between classical and modern Japanese. This distinction should not, however, mislead readers into believing that all of Japanese language history is divided into only two periods. Japanese scholars commonly divide language history into five periods:1

2. Periods of Japanese Language History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old Japanese (OJ)2</td>
<td>- 794 [Nara and before]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Old Japanese (LOJ)</td>
<td>794-1191 [Heian]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Japanese (MdJ)</td>
<td>1192-1602 [Kamakura-Azuchi]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Modern (EMJ)</td>
<td>1603-1867 [Edo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern Japanese (MJ)</td>
<td>1868- [Meiji and after]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LOJ period, with which we are concerned, is also often subdivided as follows:

3. Subdivisions of the Heian Period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Early Heian Period</td>
<td>794-900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Heian Period</td>
<td>901-1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Late Heian Period</td>
<td>1001-1086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insei Period</td>
<td>1087-1191</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A brief glance at the above tables shows that the language with which we are concerned is LOJ, but that the *Genji* was probably written at the border of the Middle and Late Heian Periods. It is generally considered to fall, however, among Late Heian, as opposed to Middle Heian works. Consequently, the following comments, although relevant to classical Japanese in general to a certain extent, should be thought of as applying particularly to the LOJ of the Late Heian period in particular.

This thesis is not the place to attempt a full description of the grammar of LOJ, and as there are any number of works that already perform this function,3 all that will be attempted is a simple summary.

LOJ is a Subject-Object-Verb or SOV language. In other words, in a clause, the syntactic elements Subject, Object and Predicate appear in the order SOV, unlike English, for example, which is an SVO language. As an SOV language, LOJ shares a

---

1 I am indebted to Dr Stefan Kaiser for suggesting the use of the following divisions of Japanese language history and of the LOJ period.
3 For example: O'Neill (1968), Matsumura (1973), Ikeda (1975) and Akiba (1978)
number of general tendencies with other languages of the same type, the marking of
grammatical role with postpositions as opposed to prepositions to name but one. The
most important element in a LOJ sentence is the predicate, indeed it is possible for a
sentence to consist of nothing but a single predicate, that is a verb or adjective, as
there is no requirement for a grammatical subject to be present in a sentence as there
is in English; neither do verbs inflect for person, introducing a high degree of context-
dependence into the language as the same verb form can cover the whole range of
meanings from first person singular to third person plural. Furthermore, nuances of
tense, aspect, modality, voice and negation are added to verbs by building up affixes
after them, rather than with auxiliary verbs as in English. Finally, the language
possesses a highly developed system of honorific language, allowing status
differences between speaker and addressee to be simply expressed by various
syntactic and lexical choices.

The above is a nutshell description of LOJ syntax and, in fact, of MJ syntax as
well. Everything that has been said above as true of LOJ is also true of the modern
language, so it might be thought that the language has changed remarkably little over
the past thousand years. In general this is true, for example the following structure for
the LOJ Verb Phrase has been identified:

Main verb (Voice)(Honorific)(Aspect)(Tense)Conjugational Suffix

The elements in parentheses are optional. Let us then compare an analysis of the LOJ
verb form:

(1) saburaFitamaFikeri

and a MJ one:

(2) okakininatta

Late Old Japanese

| saburaFi- | -tamah- | -iker- | -i |
| main verb | honorific | tense | conjugation |

---

Modern Japanese

\[ \text{Honori} \text{fic Main Verb Honor} \text{ific Tense} \]

It should be noted that these analyses could be criticised on a number of grounds, but they serve our purpose here, which is to show that the post-verbal structure of the Japanese verb phrase has hardly changed in the past thousand years. Similarly, the overall system of tense marking between clauses remains unchanged as do many particles, although they may have changed their roles somewhat.

Let us now, however, consider in a bit more detail the nature of the LOJ predicate which, as has been stated above, forms the most important part of the LOJ sentence. The conjugations of LOJ predicates were as follows:

4. LOJ Verb Conjugations

| 1. yodan | 4-grade (4G)\(^1\) |
| 2. kani ichidan | Upper 1-grade (U1) |
| 3. kani nidan | Upper 2-grade (U2) |
| 4. shimo ichidan | Lower 1-grade (L1) |
| 5. shimo nidan | Lower 2-grade (L2) |
| 6. ra hen | r-type (rl)\(^2\) |
| 7. na hen | n-type (nl) |
| 8. sa hen | s-type (sl) |
| 9. ka hen | k-type (kl) |

5. LOJ Adjective Conjugations

| 1. ku katsuyo | ku-type (kA) |
| 2. shiku katsuyo | shiku-type (sA) |

6. LOJ Pseudo-Adjective Conjugations

| 1. nari katsuyo | nari-type (nA) |
| 2. tari katsuyo | tari-type (tA) |

All three types of predicates had six stems as follows:

---

\(^1\)The translations given for the verb conjugations are taken from O'Neill, P.G. (1968) *A Programmed Introduction to Literary Style Japanese* School of Oriental and African Studies, Chapter 4

\(^2\)O'Neill (1968) classifies these four conjugations as irregular ones, hence the abbreviations rl etc.
7. LOJ Predicate Stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Negative Form (NF)</th>
<th>Conjunctive Form (CF)</th>
<th>Final Form (FF)</th>
<th>Attributive Form (AF)</th>
<th>Perfect Form (PF)</th>
<th>Imperative Form (IF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. mizennkei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. renyokei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. shushikei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. rentaikei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. izenkei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. meteikei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the conjugations differed according to their endings in the six stems described above. The division of predicates into six stems lies with nI verbs as these were the only conjugation which had six different stems. For example, if we take the nI verb *sinu*, then it had the following stems:

8. nI Conjugation Verb Stems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th><em>sina-</em></th>
<th><em>sini-</em></th>
<th><em>sinu</em></th>
<th><em>sinuru</em></th>
<th><em>sinure-</em></th>
<th><em>sine</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the other conjugations had some stems that were morphologically identical. Moreover, with regard to verb conjugations, they were not as complex as appears at first glance. While there were large numbers of 4G, U2 and L2 verbs; there was only one verb in each of the L1, sI and kI conjugations; the nI conjugation had two verbs only, the ri conjugation had four verbs only; and the U1 conjugation had only thirteen separate verbs and a range of compound ones with *miru*.

The classical predicate conjugations have, in MJ, become compressed into five verb conjugations and one each of adjectives and pseudo-adjectives. 4G, L1, nI and ri verbs have become modern *godan*, 5-grade, verbs; U1 and U2 have become modern U1 verbs; L2 have become modern L1 verbs; and the kI and sI conjugations remain the same, as is diagrammed in the following table:

---

1The translations of the Japanese terms are taken from O'Neill (1968) Chapter 3
It can be seen from the above that the classical system of predicate conjugations was much more complicated than that of the modern language. A further difference lies with the system of verbal affixes, *jodōshi* (助動詞), which in modern Japanese is considerably simpler than in LOJ. Both modern and LOJ possess numbers of *jodōshi* that operate in the same way, to convey meanings such as negation, tense, aspect, modality and the like. In LOJ all these affixes have different stems following the pattern set by the predicates. For example, if we consider one of the LOJ past tense markers *-tu*, we find it inflects as follows:

### 10. Inflections of *-tu*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>-te</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>-turu</td>
<td>-ture</td>
<td>-teyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This compares with the modern past tense marker *-ta* :

### 11. Inflections of *-ta*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NF</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>FF</th>
<th>AF</th>
<th>PF</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously then, the system of *jodōshi* has undergone a considerable amount of change and was much more complicated in LOJ.

Moreover, as is perhaps demonstrated by the differences in the markers above, the tense and aspect systems of the two languages are very different. This is not the place to go into the differences between the tense and aspect systems in any detail as not only has this been done elsewhere,¹ but there is a large amount of disagreement over the exact meaning of all the LOJ tense and aspect affixes, so almost any

---

description is likely to be at variance with one or other of the various theories. Therefore, we shall restrict ourselves to a few brief comments and readers are directed to the literature for more detail.

LOJ had the following affixes which are usually taken to have carried some form of either tense or aspectual meaning, or some combination of the two: -ki, -keri, -tu, -nu, -tari and -ri. Very roughly, it seems that -ki and -tu were past tense markers, indicating the distant and recent past respectively. -keri is often considered to be a narrative past tense marker, and this may have particularly been the case in the MdJ period, but during the LOJ period and before it was probably also a marker of subjectivity, indicating that the speaker or writer was making no judgements about the objective truth of what they were saying. -nu is often taken to have almost the same meaning as -tu, only being attached to a different subset of verbs, other work has indicated that it may, in fact, be a marker of punctuality, picking one action out from a series. Alternatively, it has been suggested that -nu and -tu are not tense markers, but aspectual ones, with -tu indicating volitional control over a change of state, and -nu indicating a spontaneous or self-generated change. Finally, -ri and -tari are taken as having aspectual meaning, -ri that an action or state is over and has no relevance to the present, -tari that it may or may not be over and may or may not have some relevance to the present depending upon the context. MJ has one past tense suffix, -ta and two constructions, the -te iru and -te aru forms which can possibly be defined as having a broadly aspectual meaning.

The tense and aspect systems of both MJ and LOJ are somewhat complicated by a number of factors. First, the various affixes can have different meanings depending on the exact semantic parameters of the verbs to which they are attached. Both languages divide their verbs into two rough groups: one, actions that can take time or be some sort of process; and two, actions that represent an instantaneous change from one state to another. For a MJ example, the MJ verb kaku, 'write' is a durative verb, so in its -te iru form, kaiteiru, it translates as ‘be writing’. On the other

---

hand *naru*, ‘become’ is a punctual verb so its *-te iru* form, *natteiru*, translates as ‘has/have become’ and not ‘be becoming’.

A second difficulty is introduced by the nature of LOJ literary style. Particularly in the longer *monogatari*, such as the *Genji*, it was a stylistic device to write narrative in a largely tenseless way, reserving tense marking for comments by the narrator and characters’ discourse. The general tendency would be to have brief tensed ‘frames’ on either side of a piece of narrative describing a scene, but with the majority of the scene written without tense marking. Depending upon whether the narrative was tensed or not, the aspectual affixes would have varying meanings. It is worth mentioning that this style of writing is retained into MJ literature, demonstrating once more the continuity between the classical and modern languages.

In fact, the use of tensed frames mentioned above may have some bearing on the concern of this thesis. If readers of the original were expected to recognise tensed sections as being narrator’s comments or scene-setting, it may explain why Murasaki Shikibu felt able to run her narratorial comments inside straight narrative so much. This, however, is a matter best left till later.1

As can be seen from the examples given earlier, the honorific systems of MJ and LOJ are quite different, not only lexically, but also syntactically. It is perhaps not surprising that LOJ should have such a complicated system given the importance of status in the Heian aristocrats’ society. More detailed comment on the honorific system, however, will be left until Chapter 2.

Another area where LOJ and MJ differ is in the roles played by the various grammatical particles, only some of which the two languages have in common. One particle which has excited considerable debate is the particle *Fa/wa*, which is considered a thematic topic marker in MJ, but which seems to have had a more contrastive function in LOJ.2 Another point worth noting is that while in MJ subjects

1 See Chapter 4
are marked by a particle, *ga*, in LOJ it seems it was standard to leave a subject
unmarked, with the particles *no* and *ga* only being used in particular circumstances.
Thus (written) Japanese has changed from a language which used zero subject
marking to one which uses a very definite and strict subject marking over the past
thousand years.

Possibly as a consequence of the more elaborate system of *jodōshi* in LOJ, it
was possible to be much more sparing in one's use of particles and nouns than it is in
MJ. In LOJ it is usual to omit from a sentence any element which can be derived
from the context. It is a point of some debate among linguists as to whether such
"omitted" elements have actually been omitted, or whether they were never there in
the first place. Regardless of which position is taken on this issue, however, it is a
fact that there are fewer explicit subjects or objects in LOJ than there are in either MJ
or English, and it is this which is a major factor in charges of vagueness against the
language.

Finally, a brief mention of the orthography of LOJ: the original texts were, of
course, written by hand with brushes, and mostly in *kana* with only a few *kanji*.
Furthermore, they were also written without punctuation or paragraph divisions, the
only break in a solid flow of text coming with a poem or the end of a chapter. As
modern editions are printed and tend to have *kanji*, punctuation and paragraph
divisions added, the modern scholar thus encounters a *Genji* text that looks as follows:

```
\[3S\] \[KL\] \[tA\] *
```

In a Heian period text the same passage might well have been written as follows:

```
\[\text{あさなつくることはひんかしのふんにしたまふびんかしのた}
\text{iをしつらはれたりかんたちへてんしょうひとめつらしくひ}
\text{かしにことにしてわられもわれもとつとひまゆりたまへりはかせ}
\text{ともいなかかおくしぬへはかるところなくれいあらんに}
\text{まかせてなたむることなくきびょうおこなへとおぼせたまへは}
```
Of course, the Heian text would have been written vertically and cursively, and not printed as it is here, but this example does serve to make the point that much of the information given to a modern reader was simply not present in the Heian period. Although it should be mentioned at this point that research has shown that, while the *Genji* was not written with punctuation marks, this was not the case for all classical Japanese works. Some punctuation has been observed in very early works (possibly even the eighth century *Nihon Shoki*). The fact that punctuation, even though available, was not used consistently, however, does suggest that writers of the period did not, on the whole, consider it necessary for the comprehension of their texts. This may have been due to the fact that literature of the time was written for highly educated people and that it was not until:

...literature came to be written for the wider population, [that] consideration of the ease of reading was required. It appears that employing punctuation marks to indicate where a pause should be taken served as one of the devices to make reading easier.

The fact that punctuation was not considered necessary in the original, may also indicate that LOJ had linguistic features which enabled a reader to spot the difference between, for example, speech and narrative, but this is a matter to be discussed later.

1.3.1 Classical Japanese Dialects

As has been stated earlier (Sections 1.0 and 1.1) Late Old Japanese was not by any means a homogeneous language but possessed a number of dialects, of which the only one for which we possess a great deal of evidence is the language of the court as, of course, they were the only people with the leisure and ability to engage in written pursuits. From material written in the capital, however, we do know that the Heian

---

3 Fujii (1984) p681
4 See Chapter 4
aristocrats regarded those who spoke with different accents or dialects as being extremely uncouth. There was even a particular verb, *saFeduru*, which literally means ‘twitter like a bird’, which was used as a verb of speech for people not speaking the court dialect.

While there is little readily available evidence as to the nature of the dialectal differences during the Heian period, the *Manyōshū* poetry collection, compiled in the earlier Nara period, contains a number of poems written in the dialect of Eastern Japan (*Aduma Uta*), as well as a quantity by border guards (*Sakimori Uta*) which show differences from the dialect of the court at the time. Some of the most noticeable are as follows:

1. Some words Court dialect *chi* written/pronounced as *shi*.
2. Some words Court dialect *i* written/pronounced as *u*.
3. Some words Court dialect *e* written/pronounced as *a*.
4. *naFu* used as a negative *jodo*shi.
5. Verb imperative form (IF) ends in *ro*.
6. 4G verb attributive form (AF) ends in *o*.
7. Adjective AF ends in *ke* not *ki*.

These are not the only differences cited, but others would involve a more detailed discussion of the Old Japanese vowel system than is appropriate here. Some examples of the above mentioned differences:

- *Firu tokeba* In the daytime
- *tokenaFe* Fimo no The belt I loosen or not
- *wa ga se na ni* With my husband
- *aFiyoru to ka mo* Were I to meet
- *yoru toke yasuke* It would be easy to undo at night.

(3483)

The single underlined section is an example of (4) and the double one of (7). In fact, this poem contains a further difference in that the vowel *e* used in *tokeba* is different from the one which would have been used in the court dialect.

---

The single underlined section is an example of (5), the double one of (2) and the dotted one of (1). It is, however, not at all clear to what extent the above mentioned differences were actually present in dialect speech, as has been mentioned elsewhere:

East poems are folk songs which have been quite centralized...Furthermore, with regard to the Border Guards' poems...due to the high rate of inclusion of high ranking Border Guards and the like, might it not be the case that of the Border Guards' poems, those which included dialectal elements that central people [ie. the Court TEM] were completely unable to understand, were abandoned or at the very least edited...

In other words it is likely that both sets of "Eastern Poems" give only a flavour of what the actual dialect was like, as the real thing would have been largely incomprehensible to the court audience for which the Manyōshū was intended.

Nevertheless, it is obvious from the above that there were considerable differences between the dialect spoken at court and that spoken in the provinces during the Nara period, and it is reasonable to assume that similar differences were still extant during the Heian period.

---

1 Takaki et al (1962) pp444-445
2 Tokugawa (1977) p255
1.4 Classical Japanese and Vagueness

Japanese has often been labelled a language that is somehow intrinsically vague. Even during the Meiji period, eminent Japanese were criticising their native language as being unfit for the language of a modern state. Mori Arinori even went so far as to suggest that it should be replaced by English, and immediately after the end of the Pacific War, Shiga Naoya suggested it be replaced by French. Their opinions can perhaps be discounted considering the pressure of the times in which they lived, when everything Japanese was under enormous pressure from the West and views that everything Western was automatically superior were prevalent.

Someone whose views cannot be so easily explained, however, is Tanizaki Jun’ichirō who in his *Bunshō Tokuhon*, wrote the following:

...nothing exists in Japanese worthy of the name of ‘sentence structure’ as found in English grammar...what is called ‘Japanese grammar’ is...in the main an imitation of English grammar...Japanese has no clear or evident grammar.¹

Tanizaki, one of Japan’s greatest literary figures, seems to feel that Japanese is a kind of abstruse linguistic entity with no clear structure, in other words, that it is vague.

A Westerner writing at approximately the same time as Tanizaki (*Bunshō Tokuhon* was published in 1934) was Sir George Sansom, who wrote both on Japanese history and grammar. In his *Historical Grammar of Japanese* he wrote of the *Genji Monogatari*:

Murasaki Shikibu...even her genius could not overcome the inherent defects of the pure Japanese style...it cannot be said to display any of the merits of conciseness which distinguish written Chinese...it is...to modern readers at least sometimes obscure...²

Sansom was a diplomat and not a trained linguist, so he can be forgiven his comparison of Japanese with Chinese which tells us nothing apart from the fact that they are different languages. What is of more interest is his idea that Japanese has ‘inherent defects’ which make it ‘obscure’. Later, he makes the comment that

---

² Sansom, George (1928) *An Historical Grammar of Japanese* Clarendon Press, p56
Japanese is “polysyllabic and diffuse” compared with the brevity of Chinese.¹ Sansom is making the point that Tanizaki was to repeat six years later, Japanese is a language that, by its very nature, is difficult to apprehend.

A contemporary of Sansom was Arthur Waley, well known for his translations of both the Genji Monogatari and the Makura no Sōshi. A poet and a scholar, Waley would seem to be well-placed to comment on the nature of the language he has translated. With regard to the Makura no Sōshi, he states in his notes on the translation that he has omitted sections he felt were “dull, unintelligible, repetitive or so packed with allusion that [they] required an impracticable amount of commentary”.² Leaving aside the question of whether he was justified in omitting passages simply because they were repetitive, as the author may have been trying to create a particular effect through the use of repetition; one wonders for what reason he found sections ‘unintelligible’. A clue comes in his comments on the Genji Monogatari, where he says that “Murasaki, like all great authors, sometimes writes badly” and that he cannot accept as good style any passage where the reader is left in doubt as to what is going on.³ These comments suggest that there were sections he found difficult to understand, but he put it down to poor writing on Murasaki Shikibu’s part and not the nature of the language itself, and indeed, he pronounces himself “sceptical” about Ivan Morris’ claims of LOJ’s innate vagueness.

Morris was of the opinion that there was a “fantastic lack of specificity” in LOJ, that it “in general lacks precision”, in short, that a piece of LOJ literature amounts to nothing more than “a loose sequence of vague phrases”.⁴ In his preface to his translation of Sarashina Nikki he remarks that the problems:

...arise from the structure of the sentences themselves, and from the deliberate imprecision of classical Japanese as reflected in the scarcity of pronouns and other forms that are essential in Western writing.⁵

¹ Sansom (1928) p62
³ These comments are made in Waley’s review of Ivan Morris’ The World of the Shining Prince which is included in Morris, Ivan(ed) (1970) Madly Singing in the Mountains: An Appreciation and Anthology of Arthur Waley George Allen and Unwin Ltd., p378
⁴ Morris, Ivan (1964) The World of the Shining Prince: Court Life in Ancient Japan Penguin, p592
⁵ Morris, Ivan (1975) As I Crossed a Bridge of Dreams Penguin, p26
Morris seems to consider that the root of LOJ’s problems lie in that it does not structure itself like an Indo-European language. This charge is, of course, linguistically indefensible: languages organise and transmit information differently, and the fact that one lacks something essential in another is irrelevant. Morris, though, in his book *The World of the Shining Prince* actually provides some evidence to demonstrate his point. In his comments on the language of the *Genji* he gives the following as “a fairly literal translation” of a single sentence from it:

(3) recalling all sorts of things [and thinking] what an underhand thing this is to the person/people who joining [his/their] heart/hearts...[with me] to a remarkable...extent led me and since even in the capital [he] was not under any circumstances able to go about indiscreetly without people/a person knowing wearing an outlandish...disguise and though the feelings [of him] who was on the horse were fearful and guilty since [his] heart...was advanced in the inquisitive direction thinking as [he/they] came deep into the hills when how will it become to go back without even meeting would indeed be unsatisfying...and disgraceful...[his] heart...was stirred up.¹

This seems to be almost complete gibberish in English, so Morris seems to have convincing proof. Other evidence in support of his position comes from Edward Seidensticker, who has translated the *Genji* into English, and in his preface says the following:

...for the Westerner and Modern Japanese alike Heian Japanese...can be very obscure...only to someone who has not known anything else can the effort be other than taxing and arduous...Heian Japan[ese]...convey[ed]...information obliquely.²

One might argue that it is not surprising that people separated by such a gulf of time, culture and language should find LOJ somewhat difficult, but Seidensticker goes even further, saying that even the courtiers of Heian-Kyō must have found it vague on occasion:

*Murasaki must have been called upon countless times to explain herself. The pity is that her answers were not preserved.*³

---

¹ Morris (1964) p291
³ Seidensticker, Edward (1985) *Genji Days* K. Odansha, p88
Another eminent translator of Japanese literature, Donald Keene, has a similar message:

...simplicity and plain expression do not seem to be truly characteristic of the language, which is surely one of the world’s vaguest...Japanese sentences are apt to trail off into thin smoke...\(^1\)

With such respected voices calling LOJ “vague”, the situation seems clear cut, but unfortunately, this is not the case. It is equally possible to marshal evidence from scholars who do not consider the language “vague”. For example, Roy Andrew Miller, who has produced a strong criticism of Morris, even going so far as to retranslate his *Genji* sentence to produce the following which he claims is a “word for word rendering which adds nothing to the original not already there.”\(^2\)

(4) While many and varied were the things he recalled, as he reflected that this might well be an act he would later regret on account of the person who had once guided him as they went about together (their hearts strangely in unison the while), his sentiments as he left on his horse, wearing a disguise of a strange sort - for he was of a rank where it was impossible, even though one tried, to go about as one wished and unknown to others, particularly in the capital - were both somewhat apprehensive and also self-recriminatory; nevertheless, since his spirit was one in which curiosity took the better part, the further he advanced into the hills the more his spirit rose in excitement, as he reflected how much longer it might take, and what might happen, and especially how desolate and strange he would feel if he should return without ever having met her.\(^3\)

The sentence, if long and complex, is perfectly understandable English. Miller is exaggerating somewhat, however, when he claims to have added nothing to the original, in that English requires explicit subjects, articles and a clear distinction between singular and plural, whereas LOJ does not, and thus in order to make his translation natural sounding English, he has been obliged to make these additions. This is a natural part of the translation process, however, and does not invalidate his main point, which is that LOJ was, on the whole, a very tightly structured language, and definitely not “vague”. On the other hand, Miller himself has remarked upon the difficulties of LOJ elsewhere. Discussing conversation and narrative in LOJ, he says:

---

\(^{1}\) Keene, Donald (1955) *Japanese Literature: An Introduction for Western Readers* p.7 quoted in Miller (1986) p99

\(^{2}\) Miller (1986) p102

\(^{3}\) Miller (1986) p102
...it is all but impossible to unravel these several strands of language...particularly the question of who is supposed to be speaking at any particular moment.1

If we consider all of the above comments, we seem to get a remarkably consistent picture, right the way from the Meiji period to the present day. Scholars seem to feel that there is something about Japanese that makes it difficult to grasp. It lacks structure and is “vague”. One may suspect that part of the problem may lie with the fact that Japanese culture is so different from that of the West. One does not, after all, hear attacks on the Latin and Greek languages for being “vague”. The difference of the Japanese tradition, however, cannot be held solely responsible. Chinese, with its equally distant tradition, is held up as a model of conciseness2 and clear expression. What is it, then, about the LOJ language that has made so many people label it “vague”?

1.5 Linguistic Attitudes to Vagueness

In the previous section we have seen that numerous scholars have accused the Japanese language, both classical and modern of being intrinsically vague, while others have disagreed. One problem that one comes across when reading these various scholars’ works, is that it often seems that they are using the term “vagueness” in a fairly vague way, often making no attempt to define what it is that they regard as falling under its aegis. Insofar as this thesis is concerned with the topic of vagueness, it is considered that it may be helpful to provide an overview of current approaches to the topic of vagueness, before going on to define exactly what type of vagueness it is that this thesis will make its concern.

Linguistics as a subject covers a very wide range of approaches to the study of language. Consequently, there are a number of different approaches to the issue of vagueness which deserve some consideration. First, there is the syntactic approach, seeing vagueness as being primarily a result of a language’s syntactic structure.

---

1 Miller, Roy Andrew (1982) Japan's Modern Myth: The Language and Beyond Walter Hill, p89
2 Sansom (1928)
Second, there is the semantic approach, seeing vagueness as being the result of words or expressions having wide ranges of meaning. Third, there is the pragmatic approach, seeing vagueness as being a consequence of utterance context. Finally, deserving of a brief mention, even though not really within the purview of linguistics, is the approach taken to vagueness by literary criticism, which has a very different approach from that adopted by most linguistics.\(^1\)

Another point worth making is that in technical works linguists are usually careful to make a distinction between "vagueness" and "ambiguity", and so when used technically these terms refer to two different linguistic phenomena. Unfortunately, in a non-technical sense, "vagueness" can cover some of the phenomena technically associated with ambiguity and vice versa. Thus in declaring LOJ to be vague, as a result of their use of the word "vagueness" in a general, non-technical sense, scholars often cover both vagueness and ambiguity. Consequently, it is necessary to consider linguistic attitudes to ambiguity also.

1.5.1 The Syntactic Approach

First, let us consider the syntactic approach to vagueness. The aim in syntax is to provide a description of the way a language works and not, as it might be thought, to provide a series of rules to follow in order to speak it properly. There are numerous different grammars and grammatical theories, each with their own method of analysing and representing the structure of a language’s grammar. But it is to a certain extent an idealised version of a language, in that syntax draws a distinction between two concepts, linguistic competence and linguistic performance. Competence is the ability to speak a language, while performance is what happens in the real world when speakers produce sentences.

All grammatical theories generally consist of sets of rules intended to model linguistic competence. The specifics of the particular theories can vary very widely

\(^1\)Refer to section 1.5.4 for a discussion on this point.
and strong passions can be aroused in support of particular theories, or even particular
versions of one theory.

To return to vagueness, for syntacticians the issue is two-fold. First, in the
purview of the total theory, both vagueness and ambiguity would be considered
matters for filtering rules, so that sentences which were too vague or ambiguous to be
grammatical could be blocked. As a corollary to this it would also be necessary to
develop tests to separate vagueness from ambiguity so that the correct type of filter
could be applied. Unfortunately:

...grammatical tests in general and ambiguity tests in particular, reflect
the theory within which they are framed...Ⅰ

so there are no general all purpose tests which are capable of being applied within the
framework of any theory. The purpose of such tests, however, would be to
distinguish vague sentences such as:

(11) My sister is Ruritanian Secretary of State.

from ambiguous ones such as:

(12) They saw her duck.

and also to attempt to discover the reasons for the sentence’s vagueness or ambiguity.
The former sentence is considered to be vague because of its *generality*; it says
nothing about the age of the sister, her name or any of a host of other details. The
latter sentence is obviously ambiguous due to the two different meanings of the word
*duck*. Depending upon which interpretation is chosen, the structure of the sentence is
different. For example, the structure associated with the meaning “They saw her
water bird” would be:

1.5.2 The Semantic Approach

If we turn now to consider the traditional semantic attitude to vagueness, we will see a very different way of approaching the subject. Semanticists have primarily seen vagueness and ambiguity as being connected with *words* as opposed to *structures*. If one word form has more than one meaning, then this is a potential cause of vagueness, but it:
[is] not a uniform feature but has many aspects and may result from a variety of causes. Some of these are inherent in the very nature of language, whereas others only come into play in special circumstances.¹

For a semanticist it may be considered possible to characterise languages as having tendencies towards or away from vagueness depending upon the nature of their vocabulary. For example, Ullman describes French as “a highly abstract...instrument”² because of its preference for using generic terms supplemented by the context of utterance, as opposed to English and German which are “concrete” by virtue of their use of particular expressions.

Another way of considering vagueness is to see it as the natural result of human attempts to impose boundaries on non-linguistic phenomena in the real world which do not possess them. One example of this is in the use of colour words. It is entirely possible for two native speakers of a language to disagree over the right colour term to use to describe a real-world object, and between languages the problems are even more intractable. Even between closely related languages, or ones whose speakers have a good deal of contact, colour terms are likely to be quite different and cover different areas of the spectrum. For example, MJ has the colour ao which is used to describe the colour of a clear sky, that of a traffic signal indicating ‘go’, and also of a person’s face when they faint. Consequently the English translation of this word would be either blue, green or pale depending upon its context, but none of the three words adequately expresses the real meaning of the Japanese.

When the discussion switches to considering abstract concepts, then the:

...lack of boundaries is even more conspicuous since the distinctions are largely man-made.³

A concept like democracy or even love can be many different things and it is always difficult in discussions to know whether one’s addressee means the same thing by them. In spite of this, however, it is probably true to say that despite the vagueness of

---

² Ullman (1962) p123
³ Ullman (1962) p126
many words, on the whole in most conversational situations, misunderstandings and lack of understanding between speaker and addressee are the exception and not the rule. Linguists are thus faced with the fact that speakers are able to both disambiguate words and derive the specific from the general in conversation. As a result of this, after some thought, semanticists have proposed the concept of context of utterance:

...a theoretical construct...the linguist abstracts from the actual situation and establishes as contextual all factors which, by virtue of their influence on the participants in the language event, systematically determine the form, the appropriateness or the meaning of utterances.¹

An utterance is defined as “the issuance of a sentence, a sentence-analogue, or sentence-fragment, in an actual context”,² as opposed to a sentence which is “an abstract theoretical entity defined within a theory of grammar”.³ An utterance, of course, does not have to be a spoken representation of a sentence; written language is just as much an utterance.

It is still a matter of some debate, however, exactly how far the concept should extend. Firth, for example, even went so far as to suggest that a sentence without an utterance context was meaningless:

They may be grammatically meaningful; and yet; and yet, if they do not have what Firth refers to as the implication of utterance in some culturally acceptable and interpretable situation, they will not be meaningful at the semantic level of analysis.⁴

Other semanticists would probably not go quite as far as Firth, but would support his position to a greater or lesser extent, in that it can be said to be generally accepted that context plays a large part in the meaning of any piece of language. Some would even include the speakers’ age, race, sex, level of education and the like in their definition of context, and this is before considering the role of contextually sensitive syntactic elements such as deixis and anaphoric reference.

¹ Lyons, John (1977) Semantics Cambridge University Press, p572
³ Levinson (1983) p18
⁴ Lyons (1977) p610
1.5.3 The Pragmatic Approach

Postulating that some part of meaning is derived from context is a neat way of explaining why, with so much apparent scope for vagueness and ambiguity within language, speakers understand each other most of the time. It is not enough, however, and in the field of Pragmatics, the study of language in context, a further notion has been advanced, that of conversational implicature.

This theory was first proposed by Grice in 1967 and has been the topic of much debate since. For our purposes, however, we need only consider the basics. Grice proposed that language behaviour took place according to a set of overarching, generalised rules which he codified as the co-operative principle:

*The co-operative principle*
make your contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs, by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which you are engaged

*The maxim of Quality*
try to make your contribution one that is true, specifically:
(i) do not say what you believe to be false
(ii) do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence

*The maxim of Quantity*
(i) make your contribution as informative as is required for the current purposes of the exchange
(ii) do not make your contribution more informative than is required

*The maxim of Relevance*
make your contributions relevant

*The maxim of Manner*
be perspicuous, and specifically:
(i) avoid obscurity
(ii) avoid ambiguity
(iii) be brief
(iv) be orderly

If all these rules were followed in conversation, then the participants would be communicating in the most efficient way possible. A moment's thought, however, will lead one to think that Grice must be in error. In conversation it might seem that people very rarely follow his maxims so what is the point to them?

---

1 The following discussion is based upon that in Levinson (1983) Chapter 3
2 Quoted from Levinson (1983) pp101-102
Grice, however, has an answer to this. He claims that people assume that conversation is carried out according to the co-operative principle and its maxims, even when on the surface it might seem that it is not. For example:

(13)  
A: Where's Bill?  
B: There's a yellow VW outside Sue's house.¹

This conversation might seem to be non-co-operative, after all the question was not about the location of a car, but in fact any English speaker can interpret it as meaning that Bill owns a yellow VW, is Sue’s friend and so is probably located inside her house. Thus even non-co-operative statements are interpreted co-operatively. Grice further introduces the notion of *flouting* the maxims, deliberately not obeying them in order to make a conversational point. For example:

(14)  
A: Teheran's in Turkey isn't it, teacher?  
B: And London's in Armenia I suppose.²

B’s blatant violation of the maxim of Quality serves to suggest that A’s statement is equally absurd. These types of inferences are described as *implicatures*. Implicatures allow speakers to derive the meaning of sections of language according to their knowledge of contextual factors. If these ideas are taken to their logical conclusion, then there should be no vagueness or ambiguity in language, providing that one has an appropriate knowledge of the context of utterance, and where apparent vagueness or ambiguity appears, it is there for a reason. Of course, this is not entirely the case, people make mistakes or assume that their addressees have information they do not and as a result misunderstandings do occur. To return to the *Genji* briefly, however, if Murasaki Shikibu was being conversationally co-operative when she wrote her book, then she would not have made it too vague to understand and it is our lack of knowledge of the appropriate context which causes our difficulties in understanding the text.

¹ From Levinson (1983) p102  
² From Levinson (1983) p110
1.5.4 The Literary Critic’s Approach

Finally, let us briefly consider the literary critic’s attitude to ambiguity.

According to a well known critic, an ambiguity is:

...any verbal nuance, however slight, which gives room for alternative reactions in the same piece of language.¹

In other words, any piece of language where an author has, consciously or not, superimposed two or more ideas, is an ambiguity. The emphasis here is on ambiguity as a stylistic device for the effect it causes in the mind of a reader. The important point here, though, is that Empson does not consider that the ambiguities cause difficulties in understanding the text. In fact, his interpretation is precisely the opposite, ambiguity actually enhances understanding of a text by providing additional interpretations.

1.6 The Meaning of Vagueness and Aims of this Thesis

It may be useful, therefore, to attempt to define what this thesis will understand as “vagueness” within the text of the Genji Monogatari, and what it will not. In Hahakigi, we have the following passage:

(15) 人がらのたをやぎたるに、強き心をしげて加へたれば、なよ竹の心地して、さすがに折るべくもあらず。まこと
に心やましくて、あがちなる御心ばへを、いふ方なしと
思ひて、泣く様などいとゑなり。

Fitogara no tawogitaru ni tuki kokoro wo siFite kuFaFetareba
nayotake no kokotisite sasuga ni woru beku mo arazu makoto
ni kokoroyanassikute anagaiinaru oFon-kokorobaFe wo
iFukatanast to omoFite naku sama nado ito aFare nari²

This could be rendered into English as:

(16) While she was of a yielding nature, as she forced her heart to be strong, she felt like a young bamboo and really would not break. She thought his disturbing and unreasonable behaviour to be beyond what was acceptable, and she looked pitiful as she wept.³

¹ Empson, William (1953) Seven Types of Ambiguity (3rd ed) Chatto and Windus, pl
² Inaizumi et al (1976) p44
³ All translations are my own unless otherwise stated.
Reading this extract in isolation, a reader might be forgiven for not understanding what is going on between the man and the woman in question, and thinking the passage "vague", and in one sense it is. Murasaki Shikibu is deliberately not describing the actions of her characters, but their emotional states, while she leaves it to the reader's imagination to work out what is actually going on. A reader knowing the context of the passage, that Genji has more or less kidnapped Utsusemi from her bedroom and taken her to his own, would have no difficulty in working out exactly what Genji's "disturbing and unreasonable behaviour" entailed. This use of vagueness is a deliberate stylistic choice on the part of Murasaki Shikibu, and as such does not fall within the remit of this thesis.

On the other hand, a second look at the original reveals a second possible translation:

(17) While was of yielding nature, as forced heart to be strong, felt like young bamboo and really would not break. Thought disturbing and unreasonable behaviour, to be beyond what was acceptable, and looked pitiful as wept.

This certainly seems a great deal more "vague" than the version given previously, and yet it is a literal representation of the words of the original. Grammatical subjects have been omitted, as is normal in the *Genji* text, but the syntax has been followed fairly closely. A single sentence written in this manner is difficult enough to understand, when the same style is continued for pages, and speech, thought and narrative are all run into each other then it is not difficult to see why the language has been called "vague". Indeed, it seems that when scholars call the language "vague", what they mean is "difficult to understand" or even sometimes "impossible to understand". The question to be addressed, however, is not whether the *Genji* is difficult to understand now, for it undoubtedly is, and considering the distance of time and culture, this is no surprise, but whether it was difficult to understand then, when it was written. Would a person with a firm grounding in the syntax, vocabulary and socio-cultural background of Heian-Kyō, still have had to struggle with the meaning of the text of the *Genji*. The above quotation from Seidensticker suggests he thinks
so, and more evidence is supplied by the following, which he wrote after hearing an extract from one of the Watergate tapes:

It is next to incomprehensible. Through the densest vapours one senses a vague intimation of meaning. And yet... they must have understood each other—through tone of voice, facial expression, gesture... I kept thinking... even such is the prose of The Tale of Genji, and perhaps it was through such extra verbal devices that meaning was conveyed.1

This speculation gains more weight when one considers that we have evidence from Murasaki Shikibu’s own diary that the *Genji* was read aloud at court to the Emperor.2 On the other hand, in *Sarashina Nikki* the author writes of reading the *Genji* to herself behind her curtain.3 Considering that she was an adolescent at the time, it seems unlikely that she would have been so eager to read something very difficult to understand. Furthermore, with regard to the *Genji*, there is evidence that:

...the absence of polite expressions in narrative indicate[s] that the author thought of her work as something to be read by an individual reader and not as something she would read to an audience.4

Again we have conflicting views, and no real way of resolving them, but in any case whether or not the *Genji* was primarily intended to be read aloud the question remains as to whether its language is “vague” or not. In this thesis we will test the hypothesis that:

...the classical authors wrote clearly enough to be understood by their contemporaries, and that when we are defeated by their syntax it is a measure of our distance from the spirit and subtleties of the classical world. Some connection obvious to the classical reader has been missed, some allusion overlooked, some nuance of expression ignored, some feature of society misunderstood.5

Consequently, in this thesis we will adapt the ideas about vagueness discussed in sections 1.5.1–3 for our own use and consider vagueness, that is, problems of understanding, in a text to be caused by a combination of linguistic factors. Thus, the
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1 Seidensticker (1983) p200
2 Hasegawa et al (1989) p314 「内裏の上の源氏の物語をやさしくつつ聞こしあげるのにこの人は日本語をこそ精みたべかせゝるにさぐるべしとのたたきをけるれど...” “Nihon-ga na no genji no monogatari Filo ni yomaretemaFilus kikoshaekuresa ni kono Filo Pa nibangi wo koso yomitaru bekere makoto ni zae aru beki to notamaFaekuresa wok...’. Bowring (1982) translates the passage as follows: “His Majesty was listening to someone reading *The Tale of Genji* aloud. “She must have read the Chronicles of Japan!” he said. “She seems very learned.”” p137
3 See Endnote for a discussion of this passage, which has various different interpretations.
5 Ikeda Tadashi (1975) *Classical Japanese Grammar Illustrated with Texts* The Tōhō Gakukai, p4
lack of explicitly stated grammatical subjects and objects is syntactic vagueness. A lack of sufficient information in the text is pragmatic vagueness. A text excerpt may be vague as a result of the language’s structure, syntactically vague, and yet still be comprehensible when pragmatic, contextual features are taken into consideration and *vice versa*. After all, a perfectly readable and comprehensible English translation of (15) has been produced, so there must be mechanisms which allow readers of a LOJ text to apprehend its meaning. Consequently, we will take as our starting point the assumption that when Murasaki Shikibu wrote her book, she was performing a cooperative act. In other words, that she expected, and intended, her readers to be able to understand what she was writing, and that she put into her text as much information as she considered necessary to ensure that they did. Thus we will be trying to prove in the course of our research that the text, in fact, contains no vagueness as we have defined it, and that it would only appear to be so as a result of a lack of understanding of the way in which the language operated.
1.7 Problems of a Classical Text and The Genji’s Textual History

In any study of a classical language text, however, there are problems which must be considered. First, given the length of time which separates us from the period in which the work was written, we must always be aware that the text we have now may bear little resemblance to the one actually written by the author. In her own diary Murasaki Shikibu wrote the following:

I had brought the various books of the Tale and hidden them in my chamber and, when I was with Her Majesty, My Lord went in quietly and found them, I hear he gave them to Lady Naishi no Kan.2 All the revised copies have been taken; doubtless I shall get a bad reputation.

If as early as this (the extract has been dated at 1008), the author herself had already lost her good copies, then it is no surprise that there should be some textual confusion. The passage from Sarashina Nikki mentioned earlier, demonstrates that only a few years later it was difficult to get hold of a complete Genji text, as has been noted elsewhere.3 It must therefore come as no surprise that in the present day there is more than one version of the Genji text.

There is evidence to suggest that, at the end of the Heian period, there were as many as six separate Genji texts in circulation, none of which was Murasaki Shikibu’s original, although some of them may have been copied from it. By Kamakura times the novel had become the subject of scholarly attention as the language became more remote from the language of the time. Consequently, attempts were made to produce authoritative texts, resulting in two main textual families, the Kawachi recension (河内本), which takes its name from the fact that its editors Minamoto Mitsuyuki (源光

---

1 Hasegawa et al (1989) p285
2 The title refers to one of Michinaga’s daughters.
3 Bowring (1988) p84
and his son Chikayuki (親行) both held the position of Governor of Kawachi: and the *Aobyōshi* (青表紙) or "Blue Covers" recension, which is the work of Fujiwara Teika (藤原定家) (1162-1241). In an extract from his diary, dated 1225, he writes:

> Since the eleventh month of last year, I have had the young women of the household copying the fifty-four books of the *Genji Monogatari*. The covers were finished yesterday; today we will write the chapter titles.1

So it seems safe to assume the *Aobyōshi* was completed near this date, and it is known that the Kawachi recension was completed in 1255.2 This was still two hundred years after the time Murasaki Shikibu could last have put brush to paper, and neither of the original Kawachi or Aobyōshi texts survive to the present day. There is also a set of miscellaneous texts which fit in to neither of the major categories, which are grouped together under the name of Beppon (別本) and a few fragments of text on an illustrated *Genji* scroll, dating from the early Kamakura period, making it the earliest extant text, which is very different from either the Kawachi or Aobyōshi recensions.

The modern consensus is that the *Aobyōshi* is probably closer to the original, although no one would claim it is exactly as Murasaki Shikibu wrote it. The Iwanami Shoten Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei version is based upon a text dating from 1304 which is described as being:

> ...最も信頼すべき貴重な青表紙の訳本...3
> ...mottomo shinraisu beki kichō no aobyōshi no shōhon...
> ...the most valuable *aobyōshi* text which should be relied upon...

But this text still dates from three hundred years after the *Genji*’s time of writing. It is, therefore, essential that reference is made to the widest possible number of texts, and that the various different versions are compared to attempt to eliminate as far as possible distortions caused by miscopyings and the like. Fortunately, in *Genji*’s case the differences between the textual traditions are not too great, unlike that of the

---

1 The translation is from Bowring (1988) p64
2 Bowring (1988) p84
3 山岸徳平 (1958) 日本古典文学系14: 遺文物語1岩波書店、17頁 (Yamagishi Tokuhei (1958) Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei 14: Genji Monogatari Iwanami Shoten, p17)
Makura no Sōshi, which has so many disparate versions it is next to impossible to decipher the form of the original.1

1.8 Methodology

In order to study vagueness in the Genji a number of different avenues will be pursued. First, there is the question of the nature and role of the system of honorific language, or keigo, in LOJ. Does the fact that the choice of vocabulary and certain verbal inflections depends upon the status of the character being described, make it easier for subjects to be omitted? Are subjects more likely to be included when the narrative concerns two or more characters of the same rank, or is some other method employed? Also, is it possible to identify characters purely through the keigo which is applied to them, and is there any correlation between the rank of a character and the likelihood of their being an explicit or implicit subject?

One syntactic feature that has been proposed for LOJ is switch reference (SR). That is, that some clause-final particles indicate either the retention of that clause’s subject for the subsequent clause, or its change. Can such a system be firmly shown to exist in LOJ? If so, what role does it play in the elimination of vagueness from the text?

As was mentioned earlier, the original Genji texts were written without punctuation of any sort, nor were any divisions made to indicate where one paragraph ended and the next one began. Modern texts add both punctuation and paragraph divisions, but it is necessary to ask what features of LOJ allowed such things to be omitted. Particularly important to establish are the features that allowed a reader to distinguish between speech and narrative, and between straight narrative and the character’s thoughts. For example, are there any syntactic features which regularly precede and follow passages of speech, or are there vocabulary items which regularly

---

1 For more details on the Genji’s textual history, see 山岸徳平 (1972) 「源氏物語の結末」山岸徳平、岡一男(監修) (1972), 1-68頁
(Yamagishi Tokuhei (1972) "Genji Monogatari no Shozen" in Yamagishi Tokuhei, Oka Kazuo (eds) (1972), pp1-68)
occur at the beginning of passages of speech in order to set them apart from the surrounding narrative?

Another interesting topic for research is the whole question of character identification in the *Genji*. Much has been made of the difficulty of translating it into English as a result of the fact that none of the major characters has a personal name,1 something which goes against the entire Western literary tradition. Instead they are referred to by “a series of shifting sobriquets”,2 which change with the characters’ alterations in rank and position. It might seem that this would lead to great difficulty in identifying exactly who was doing what at any one point in the book, hence the development of a series of “nicknames” for the major characters, thus Kiritsubo for Genji’s mother, Murasaki for his greatest love and indeed, Genji for the man himself. The question is, when did these nicknames first come into common usage? Were they actually being used at court while Murasaki Shikibu was still there? If they were, it would be a strong piece of evidence to suggest that even native speakers of LOJ found the *Genji* somewhat difficult. Unfortunately, it is a question which is likely to go permanently unanswered, due to our lack of information about the time. There is, however, one piece of evidence which might be quoted in support of this view, and it comes from Murasaki Shikibu’s own diary. There is an incident related in the diary when a nobleman comes looking for her with the words “Would our little Murasaki be in attendance by any chance?”. This incident is widely thought to record the genesis of the name by which we know the author of the *Genji Monogatari*, but more interesting from our point of view is Murasaki Shikibu’s reply which could be translated as either “I cannot see the likes of Genji here, so how could she be present?”3 or “There’s no one here who could be in the Genji...”. If her comment

---

2 Seidensticker (1981) p61
3 The translation is from Bowring (1982) pp90-91, where he says, “Most commentators...agree that the word Genji here refers to the man rather than to the work.” The original reads: 左衛門の門「あなかなか、この人たちにわかれらさきやさりふ」とかがり絵ふ。源氏にかか るべき人見え絵はぬれ、かのうへはまいていかでものを絵はむ、と聞きたり。seidensticker (1980) pp35-36
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means the former then, considering the nobleman’s earlier question, it suggests that the nicknames were used at court, even by the author herself and thus that identifying the characters has always been a problem, ever since the work was written. We can, however, consider the various sobriquets used to identify characters and attempt to discover if there was a reason for different ones being used in different scenes and chapters. Furthermore, we will also wish to consider the usage of personal pronouns in the text and the whole question of third person reference using various demonstratives to refer to characters.

Various different corpora of text have been used in different chapters. The preliminary corpus consists of all the occasions where reference is made to Fujitsubo, from the beginning of the novel to the end of Momiji no Ga where she is made Empress. This corpus was selected because, as a major character who interacts closely with both Genji and the Emperor we are likely to get a good sample of the elements we wish to study from her appearances. Where no such elements appeared in this corpus, others were selected. Finally, it was decided that it was necessary to study further text to gain enough data for Chapter 5, and thus the corpus was expanded to include all explicit references to Genji, Fujitsubo, Tō no Chūjō and Murasaki from the first ten chapters of the novel.
Endnotes

1. The relevant section, taken here from Haegawa et al (1989) p385, reads as follows:

The passage is somewhat complex, and translation is complicated by the fact that the expression Fasiru Fasiru occurs nowhere else in the classical canon. There is some debate as to whether it means "with pounding heart" as it is taken here, or "in a great hurry". If the latter meaning is taken, it is also unclear as to whether the author means that she hurried home to read the Genji, or that previously she had only been able to look at it briefly. Morris (1975) clearly takes this view in his translation:

In the past I had been able to have only an occasional hurried look at fragments of The Tale of Genji, and much of it had remained infuriatingly obscure. Now I had it all in front of me and I could sit undisturbed behind my curtain, bent comfortably forward as I took out the books one by one and enjoyed them to my heart's content. I wouldn't have changed places with the Empress herself. Morris (1975) p46-47

This is not the place to discuss Morris' translation in detail, but his description of the Genji as "infuriatingly obscure" does call for some comment. His translation as it reads could give rise to the interpretation that the author found the Genji so vague that it was difficult to understand. This seems highly unlikely, and another interpretation is called for:

Before I had been able to read only bits and pieces, and didn't really know how the story went. Now I had the whole Genji to read from the very first volume. Bowring (1988) p83

This makes more sense, and agrees with the commentator, whose note for the relevant part of the original text reads:

部の繋がりも納得出来ず

My feelings, my heart pounding, lying behind a curtain undisturbed by anyone, pulling out and seeing, from the very first chapter, the Genji of which I had seen only a little and, not understanding, felt to be irritating, even to the rank of Empress, for what would I change?

There was a warrior of frightening power, called Taifu no Gen, who had many relations in the province of Higo and had a reputation there. With the roughness of his heart was mixed a little liking for the ways of love and it seems he was thinking of collecting women of some beauty. Hearing of the Princess, he pressed his suit most politely, saying, "Even if she looks dreadful, I'll close my eyes."...
Not knowing of the grief, thinking he was a man of great reputation and status, he wrote and sent letters and the like. The hand was not unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasantly scented. He thought they were attractively written, the words though unpleasant and the many coloured Chinese paper was always pleasant...
Chapter Two

Honorifics

2.0 Introduction

It is probably true that more has been written about the Japanese system of honorifics, or *keigo* (敬語) than about any other aspect of the Japanese language. So extensive is this literature that one might be led to believe that honorifics were something particular to Japanese and not found in any other language. This is not true; all languages have methods of expressing respect and deference through speech, although not many systems are as complex as that of Japanese. Even English, for example, which cannot strictly be said to possess grammaticalised honorifics, can show a great number of different levels of politeness. All the way from:

1. Want a cup of tea?
2. Might you possibly care for a cup of tea?

Any language is a reflection of the society that uses it, and considering that the Japanese language has always had some sort of grammaticalised honorific system, it seems that the nature of Japanese society has changed little in the last thousand years. That is not to say that the *keigo* system was the same at the time of Murasaki Shikibu as it is now, in fact it has undergone just as many changes as the rest of the language, but *keigo* was present then, and still is, so something in the society has remained constant.

In this chapter we will consider the role played by honorifics in the text of the *Genji Monogatari* and how far they served as a way of identifying characters, thus making explicit subject and object reference unnecessary. Before we can do this, however, it will be necessary to establish a framework for our description of honorifics. Thus this chapter will begin with a consideration of some of the strategies which underlie politeness in general and then continue with a brief survey of some of the Japanese and other literature on honorifics, before moving on to consider LOJ
honorifics. Next we will consider the usage of honorifics in the *Genji*, seeing how far particular characters may have been “tagged” with particular *keigo* combinations in order to identify them to readers, and how honorifics actually work in passages of text.

Subsequently, we will move on to consider the subject of court rank, and whether a character’s likelihood of receiving implicit subject reference was affected by their position in the court hierarchy. We will also examine the strategies used by the author when dealing with more than one character of similar rank: whether there is more explicit subject reference, or other methods are used. This should allow us to draw some conclusions about the clarificatory functions of *keigo*, and the inherent vagueness of the *Genji* text.

### 2.1 Politeness in General

If one looks up the definition of “politeness” in a dictionary, one will probably find a definition something like the following:

> [The quality of] having refined manners, [being] courteous; cultivated, cultured; well-bred...²

which is an entirely circular definition, because on looking up “courtesy”, one is likely to find it defined as “being polite”, and thus one is left none the wiser about what exactly is involved. It therefore becomes necessary to consider exactly what is involved in “being polite”.

First, politeness is not merely a feature of language; virtually the whole range of human behaviour can be defined in terms of how polite it is. Second, politeness is extremely culture specific; polite behaviour in one culture may be extremely impolite according to another one’s *mores*. Third, polite behaviour is more likely to occur when people with different social status are interacting, than when the people are of

---

¹The description of politeness given here is based upon the positions taken in Brown and Levinson (1987) *Studies in Interactional Sociolinguistics 4: Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* Cambridge University Press, and reference should be made there for a much more detailed discussion of the issues involved than can be attempted here.

equal status. In other words the social distance between the speaker (S) and the addressee (H) will often determine the level of politeness used. There are, of course, other considerations such as the formality of the situation; whether there are any bonds of debt or obligation between the people concerned; the intimacy of their relationship and so on. It is obvious, then, from a few moments’ thought that politeness is a vast area for study in a whole range of academic disciplines. Fortunately, we need only consider linguistic politeness, and here it does seem that there are some deep-seated universals which can be used to describe politeness, regardless of the actual language being spoken.

One position could be that all speakers of a language have face, a quality which can be further subdivided as follows:

- **negative face**: the want of every ‘competent adult member’ [of society] that his actions be unimpeded by others.
- **positive face**: the want of every member that his wants be desirable to at least some others.\(^1\)

Speakers must consider the effect upon their own and their addressee’s face of any action, linguistic or otherwise. If S decides to use politeness, then there is a choice between using *positive politeness*, giving support to the addressee’s positive face with approbation, flattery or paying compliments; or *negative politeness*, supporting negative face. Honorifics tend to come into this category as they consist of linguistic ways of emphasising the importance of the addressee’s actions.

There are large numbers of possible politeness strategies and this is not the place to consider them in detail, but some brief examples of positive politeness strategies could be: claim common ground with H by seeking agreement, avoiding disagreement, exaggerating approval of H; convey that S and H are co-operators by including both in the activity, giving reasons, assuming reciprocity and so on. Negative politeness strategies include: not presuming; being conventionally indirect; not coercing H; communicating S’s wants as not impinging on H; giving deference;

---

\(^1\)Brown and Levinson (1987) Ibid, p62
indicating reluctance; impersonalising S and H and so on. These are only a few examples of possible politeness strategies and each example could doubtless be divided into further sub-strategies which it is possible for S to employ. As mentioned above, however, honorifics are one type of negative politeness strategy, for the most part fitting into the category of giving deference although there are some other possible considerations which we will discuss later. The important fact to realise though, is that they are only one small part of any language’s total array of devices for demonstrating politeness and should be seen within that framework.

2.2 Honorifics

There are, of course, many different ways to approach the study of honorifics. One can do a descriptive study of the honorific system of one particular language within the bounds of one or other linguistic theory, or one could study the honorific systems of various languages in an attempt to develop a general typology of honorific types. Both of these approaches could be generally described as morpho-syntactic. Alternatively, one can study the honorific system of a language for the information it reveals about the society which uses that system. This approach is more sociolinguistic. While the sociolinguistic aspects of Japanese honorifics are a fascinating area for study in their own right, here we are mainly concerned with establishing an appropriate typology for honorifics which will serve us in our analysis of the *Genji*. It is, however, worth considering the question of what role honorifics actually play in a language. The following is one suggestion for the functions performed by honorifics in Japanese:

1. The establishment/ending of social relationships.
2. The maintenance of social relationships.
3. The preservation of social status.
4. The provision of information about actual conditions.
5. Making demands of/complaints to one’s interlocutor.

---

1 See for example Martin (1968) Chapter 6 for a descriptive account of MJ honorifics, and Hamada (1975) for a Generative account.
2 For example Wenger (1982)
3 For example Martin (1964)
In other words, the primary functions of honorifics are to establish, through linguistic means, the position of S in a social hierarchy. Or more accurately, through honorific usage S tells H what s/he thinks is the relationship between them, between S and another person, or even between two other people. Different languages use different means to do this, and have different resources available to them.

If, however, one attempts to develop a general description of honorifics, one finds that:

...there is no wide survey of, nor any descriptive apparatus or theory developed for, the honorific systems of the world’s languages. Even language-internal descriptions in the most-studied cases are fragmentary and confused.

Consequently, even when taking a brief look at the literature related to one language, one is faced with a wide variety of partially overlapping terminology, and the problem increases when other languages are considered. In order to demonstrate this, let us examine some of the extant work on Japanese honorifics.

While it is not possible to describe Japanese work on the Japanese language’s honorific system as being fragmentary, it is certainly the case that there is a wide range of different terminology to describe the various Japanese honorific phenomena; there are disagreements over the classification of different honorific forms; and even different theories about what type of linguistic phenomenon honorifics represent in Japanese. The situation can, therefore, be described as confused.

For example, one school of thought, exemplified by Yamada Yoshio (山田孝雄) and Kindaichi Kyōsuke (金田一京助) holds that honorifics function in Japanese in a similar way to grammatical person in Western languages, that is that they are a syntactic phenomenon. In contrast, Tokieda Motoki (時枝誠記) holds that honorifics are a lexical/semantic phenomenon, and the presence of honorifics simply means that the language has an extra resource not available to others. For Tokieda then, the

---

difference between the MJ honorific go-sotsugyōnasaru (御卒業なさる), "(someone of high status) graduates" and sotsugyōsuru (卒業する), "(someone) graduates", is of the same type as that between words such as *kau* (食う), "eat, gobble" and *itadaku* (頂く), "eat (politely)". Another viewpoint would be that:

...敬語には語彙的事実としての面と文法的事実としての面の方があると言わざるをえない...

...keigo ni wa goiteki jijitsu toshite no men to bunpōteki jijitsu no men no ryoho ga aru to iwazaru o ena...

...it is impossible not to say that honorifics have both syntactic and lexical features...

Obviously, this combines the viewpoints of the previous two schools, and would seem more reasonable than their absolute positions.

If there is confusion and disagreement over the nature of honorifics between Japanese scholars, there is also disagreement over how honorifics should be described, and with which terminology. The most common terminology is as follows:

1. Types of Japanese Honorifics

1. Sonkeigo (尊敬語) honorific language
2. Kenjogo (謙譲語) humble language
3. Teineigo (丁寧語) polite language
4. Bikago (美化言) beautification language

As a general rule, sonkeigo is used by S about the actions of high status people; kenjōgo about actions by him/herself or by others which effect high status people; and teineigo depending upon the formality of the situation and the degree of familiarity between the speakers. The usage of bikago does not seem to depend so much upon the relationship between S and H, as upon a desire on S's part to present themselves

---

1 This example is taken from Tsujimura Tokushiki (1992) Keigo Ronko (Consideration of Honorifics) Meiji Shoin) p167
2 Tsujimura (1992)p167
3 Tsujimura (1992) p169
as being a ‘refined’ and polite person. In MJ they are formed by the addition of the honorific prefix お- to various nouns such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Romaji</th>
<th>Romanization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>noon</td>
<td>o-hiru</td>
<td>o-hiru (お昼)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weather</td>
<td>o-tenki</td>
<td>o-tenki (お天気)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>o-kane</td>
<td>o-kane (お金)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and usage varies widely from person to person. On a socio-linguistic level, ビカゴ tend to be used more by female speakers than male ones, probably because refinement is considered to be more of a female characteristic.

More recently, a fifth category of honorific language has been postulated by some linguists. This is described as ていちょ (てい語), “courtesy language”, and defined as:

話題の事物の表現を通じて、話し手が聞き手への配慮を示す敬語

Wadai no monogoto no hyogen o toshite, hanashite ga kikite e no hairyo o shimesu keigo

Honorifics by which the Speaker shows consideration to the Hearer through all expressions of the subject matter.

To give an example: in Japanese railway stations, one will often hear announcements such as the following over the public address system:

(3) 列車は三時に出発いたします。

Ressha wa sanji ni shuppatsu ni itashimasu

The train will depart at 3 o'clock.

The honorific element here is the underlined verb いたす, usually described as the kenjōgo equivalent of する, “do”. The verb is functioning to change the noun shuppatsu, “departure”, into a verb, “to depart”. In such a situation, the announcer is not going to be departing on the train in question, nor are all the hearers, so it is difficult to interpret the verb as being kenjōgo in this context. Consequently, we must

---

2 This category of honorific was first proposed by Miyachi Hiroshi. See Tsujimura (1992) p173–174
3 Tsujimura (1992) p98
4 Taken from Tsujimura (1992) p59
ask the question: what role is the honorific playing here? It would seem that it is being used to show the politeness due to the socially superior position of the customers *vis à vis* the railway company. Similarly, when speaking to a socially superior person, S might say:

(4) 明日仙台へ参ります。
Ashita Sendai e mairimasu.
I'm going to Sendai tomorrow.

As S’s trip to Sendai may have nothing to do with H, one would not expect *mairu*, the *kenjōgo* equivalent of *iku*, “go”, to be used, but in fact, such expressions are heard quite often. As above, it seems that the honorific is being used simply to show politeness to H’s superior position.

While the terms described above (*sonkeigo, kenjōgo, teineigo, bikago* and *teichōgo*) are regarded as standard, in the sense that most ordinary Japanese would have an idea of what at least the first four of them mean, Japanese linguists have, on occasion, attempted to redefine the *keigo* system in terms of their own particular linguistic theories. Perhaps the most influential was the aforementioned Tokieda Motoki, one of Japan’s great linguistic theorists, who defined *keigo* as being divided into two broad categories:

1. 詞に属する敬語
   *ji ni zokusuru keigo*
   Honorifics which belong to *ji*.

2. 詞に属する敬語
   *shi ni zokusuru keigo*
   Honorifics which belong to *shi*.

In order for this definition to be understood and discussed, of course, it is first necessary to clearly define the categories of *ji* (辞) and *shi* (詞) into which Tokieda divides all Japanese words.  

In Tokieda’s grammar words in Japanese are divided into two types:

---

The first category of words are given the technical name of \textit{shi}, and the second category are \textit{ji}. These technical definitions are best explained by the provision of some examples. For instance, if someone is surprised, and exclaims “Oh!”, or is in pain and shouts “Ow!”, one would say that the sounds express the speaker’s feelings directly, in an almost onomatopoeic way. On the other hand, words such as “startlement” or “pain”, are conceptualised and external to the speaker. The first set of words are \textit{ji} and the second \textit{shi}.\footnote{This example is taken from Sakukura (1974) p86} A further simple example of the difference between \textit{shi} and \textit{ji} would be in the case of expressions for colours.\footnote{I am indebted to Nashtimoto Kunimao for suggesting this example.} Colour terms can be divided, in both Japanese and English, into those which are conceptualised, and those which are not. For example, the colour “red” is conceptualised, while the colour “sky blue” is not. “Sky blue” is the colour of something in the real world and does not exist as an abstract concept. On the other hand, “red” does exist as a concept; there is an abstract concept of what “redness” actually is.

This division of words then, is at the heart of Tokieda’s grammar. On a syntactic level, for example, grammatical particles and affixes such as the LOJ negative marker \textit{-zu}, are defined as \textit{ji}, while the words “denial”, “negation”, which refer to the concept \textit{-zu} expresses are \textit{shi}. Other linguists, such as Ōno Susumu (大野晋), later modified Tokieda’s theories and began to talk of \textit{jiteki na seikaku o mo sonoeta shi} (経的な性格をもぞなえた詞), “\textit{shi} which also possess the characteristics of \textit{ji}”, in order to describe inflecting words such as verbs and adjectives, the different stems of which have different meanings.

\footnote{Sakaura (1974) p92}
To return to Tokieda’s description of honorifics, his first category, that of *ji ni zokusuru keigo*, “honorifics belonging to *ji*”, are described as follows:

...敬に属する敬語は話し手の関手に対する敬意の直接的な表現であって、素材に対する関係の規定ではない...1

...*ji ni zokusuru keigo wa hanashite no kei ni taisuru keii no chokusetsuteki na hyogen deatte, sozai ni taisuru kankei no kiti dewanai...*

...honorifics which belong to *ji* are expressions which directly express the respect of the speaker for the addressee, and are not regulated by the relationship between the subjects...2

On the other hand, *shi ni zokusuru keigo*, “honorifics belonging to *shi*”, are described as follows:

...敬に属する敬語は話し手による素材の上下敬卑の識別を示したものであり、話し手の直接的な敬意の表現ではなく、素材の客体化し概念化された表現...3

...*shi ni zokusuru keigo wa hanashite ni yoru sozai no joka keipi no shikibetsu o shimeshita mono deari, hanashite no chokusetsuteki na keii no hyogen dewanaku, sozai no kyuukutsashi gainensaresita hyogen...*

...honorifics which belong to *shi* are things which show discrimination according to superior/subordinate respect/deference between the subjects by the speaker, and are not expressions which directly express the speaker’s feeling of respect, and [are] expressions which objectivise and conceptualise the subjects...

The basic distinction that Tokieda is making then, is between honorifics which in some way refer to the social difference between the speaker and addressee, or speaker and those to whom the speaker refers, and honorifics which, while conveying the speaker’s feeling of respect, do not refer to status differentials specifically. For the LOJ honorific system, the following examples are provided:

- 訳に属する敬語
  - 夜更けぬ。
  - 夜更け待りぬ。

- 詞に属する敬語
  - 甲、乙を見る。（無規範の場合）
  - 甲、乙を見給ふ。（話し手との関係による甲の動作の規定）

---

1 Negoro (1991) p12
2 Subject in this instance does not refer to the grammatical category of subject, but is a translation for the Japanese term *sozai* (素材), which is used technically to refer to the referents in a discourse.
3 Negoro (1991) p13
According to these examples then, Tokieda's *ji ni zokusuru keigo* would seem to correspond exactly to traditional *teineigo*, and *shi ni zokusuru keigo* would correspond to *sonkeigo*, *kenjögo* or a combination of both. Aware of the need to make a further distinction, he then divided *shi ni zokusuru keigo* into two types: *i shi ni zokusuru keigo* (イ詞に属する敬語) and *ro shi ni zokusuru keigo* (ロ詞に属する敬語).3 These were defined as follows:

1. **i-type keigo:**
   話手と素材との関係を規定するもの4
   *hanashite to sozai to no kantei o kitetsuru mono*

   Things regulated by the relationship between the speaker and the subject(s)

2. **ro-type keigo:**
   素材と素材との関係を規定するもの5
   *sozai to sozai to no kantei o kitetsuru mono*

---

1 Negoro (1991) p13
2 The English translation for all of these sentences would simply be “A sees B”. The characters 甲 (甲) and 乙 (乙) are used in Japanese to indicate the first two members of a series, as in English A, B, C, etc.
3 Hereafter referred to as *i-type keigo* and *ro-type keigo* respectively.
4 Negoro (1991) p13
5 Negoro (1991) p13
Things regulated by the relationship between the subjects

I-type *keigo* would be represented by the example sentence *kō, otu wo mitamaFu*, and would thus correspond to traditional *sonkeigo*, and ro-type *keigo* would be represented by the example *kō, otu wo mitatematuru*, and would correspond to traditional *kenjōgo*.

The above analysis and divisions of honorifics might seem to be providing a theoretical background and new terminology for the existing division of Japanese honorifics but, in fact, there are linguists who have disagreed with Tokieda. For example, Negoro Tsukasa (樋来司), has disagreed, in particular, with Tokieda’s idea that *shi ni zokusuru keigo* necessarily and by definition includes an objective conceptualisation of the status differences between the subjects involved. He gives the following example1 from *Kiritsubo*, where the emperor is showing concern for the infant Genji:

(5) 一の宮を見奉らせ給ふにも、若宮の御懸しさのみしき出でつゝ、親しき女房、御乳母などを追しつゝ、有様を聞召す。2

Even though he saw the first prince, all he continued to remember was the sweetness of the young prince, and he continually sent good-natured maids, his own wet nurse and others [to Genji’s grandmother’s], and asked [them] how he appeared.

---

1 Negoro Tsukasa (1992) "Kenjōgo kara Mita Genji Monogatari no Bunsho" (The Sentences of the Genji Monogatari Seen through Humble Language) in *Kokugo to Kokubungaku* 69.11: 68

2 Inazumizumi et al (1976) p5
In this section it is clear that the person doing the seeing is the emperor and that the ones being seen, thought about and asked about are the first prince and Genji himself. The problem here lies with the usage of the OH auxiliary -tatematuru in relation to the emperor’s action. In Negoro’s own words:

この「奉る」は...見る人と見られる人との間に上下敬卑の識別か考えられ、下の者から上の者に向かって見る行為を表現したもののと解することができるであろうか。¹

*kono “tatematsuru” wa...miru hito to mirareru hito no aida ni joka sonpi no shikibetsu ga kangaerare, shita no mono kara ue no mono ni mukatte miru koi o hyōgen shita mono to kaisuru koto ga dekiru dearō ka.*

This “tatematsuru”...is thought to distinguish by superior/subordinate respect/deference between the person who sees and the person who is seen, is it really possible to interpret it as having expressed the action of seeing from a subordinate to a superior?

In other words, as the subject of the above sentence is clearly the emperor, and as the emperor was clearly situated at the top of the Heian social hierarchy, why would -tatematuru, which showed deference from a subordinate to a superior, be used to describe the emperor’s action of looking at one of his children, who should be subordinate to him? Negoro then goes on to point out that there are several hundred examples throughout the whole of the novel in the narrative sections, where Tokieda’s ro-type keigo is seemingly used in reverse,² with the auxiliaries -kikoyu and -tatematuru being used to refer to the actions of socially superior persons towards subordinates, rather than the other way around. This would definitely seem to suggest that there were other considerations, besides strictly status related ones, which governed its usage and, therefore, that Tokieda’s definition of ro-type keigo is too restrictive.

It also seems that, while the editors of different *Genji* texts recognise that there is a problem in such cases, there is little agreement between them as to the reason for such “reversed” usages. For example, Negoro quotes from the footnotes of two

¹ Negoro (1992) p68
² Negoro (1992) p69
separate texts, with regard to a passage where the narrator uses -kikoyu in reference to Genji’s speaking to Tamakazura. One edition says:

この「きこゆ」(謙譲の補助動詞)は、源氏を玉髪に対して低めた言い方であるが、玉髪が話題の中心になっているので、身分関係にかわらず譲り手は玉髪のほうを高める。

kono “kikoyu” (kenjo no hojodoshi) wa, genji o tamakazura ni taishite hikuneta ikata dearu ga, tamakazura ga wadai no chushin ni natteiru node, katarite wa tamakazura no hō o takameru.

This “kikoyu” (humble auxiliary verb), is an expression which has lowered Genji with regard to Tamakazura but, as Tamakazura has become the centre-piece of the discourse, the narrator raises her.

While another, with regard to the same passage says:

玉髪に対して源氏を低める謙譲言。物語の女主人公格の扱い。

tamakazura ni taishite genji wo hikumeru kenjōgo. monogatari no onna shūjinkokaku wo atsukai.

Humble language which lowers Genji with regard to Tamakazura.
'Treatment in the case of a tale's heroine.

Thus, here we are faced with two different explanations for the usage of same honorific form in the same context: either Tamakazura is being raised because she is the current centre of the discourse, or because she is the heroine. The second explanation in particular, seems somewhat bizarre. As Negoro himself says,3 it is a “kurushii kaishaku” (きつしい解釈), a “painful interpretation”.

Both of the explanations above, however, would seem to agree on one point: that the selection of honorific forms in Heian narrative may have been more with regard to the narrator’s standpoint vis-à-vis the characters, than with the status relationships between the characters themselves. Negoro suggests, therefore, that in a context such as:

(6) 此の御方の御いさめをのみぞ、なほ煩はし心苦しう思ひ閑えさせ給ひける。

---

1 Negoro (1992) p69. The Genji edition from which the quotation is taken is Nihon Koten Bungaku Zenshu Genji Monogatari edited by Abe Akio, Akiyama Ken and Imai Gen’ei.
3 Negoro (1992) p69
4 Imazumi et al (1976) p2
kono oFon- kata no oFon- isame wo nomi zo
this SH- person P SH- reproach OBJ only P(EMPH)
naFo waduraFasiu kokorogurusiu omoFi -kikoe -sase -tamaFi
further painful sorrowful think -OH -SH -SH
-keru
-T

...this person's reproaches alone, he found hurtful and difficult to
endure.

An honorific form such as -sasetamaFu, which in Tokieda's theory would be i-type
keigo, should be referred to as a dōsashu sonkei (動作主尊敬), "actor respect", while
a form like -kikoyu, which would be ro-type keigo, should be called taish ō sonkei (対
象尊敬), "object respect".1 Other scholars have noted the same phenomenon and
invented their own terminology: Matsushita Daisaburō (松下大三郎) refers to
kyakutai sonshō (客体尊称), "object respect words" and Tamagami Takuya (玉上琢
彌) to ukete sonkei (受手尊敬), "receiver respect".2

On the more vexed question of why there are "reversed" usages of ro-type
keigo, Negoro suggests that, as such usages are particularly numerous with regard to
women to whom Genji feels special affection, for example: 57 examples toward
Tamakazura,3 139 examples toward Murasaki and 61 examples toward Jo San no
Miya,4 that:

ロの敬語の逆になるのは作中人物への心づかいを表現するもの
で...

ro no keigo no gyaku ni naru no wa sakujū jinbutsu e no kokorozukai o
hyogensuru mono de...

It is the expression of consideration toward the characters that causes
the reversal of ro-type keigo...

Later he goes further, suggesting that reversed usage of ro-type keigo:

---
1 Negoro (1992) p69. He states here that he first made this suggestion in an article, Keigo no Bunri (敬語の分類), which he wrote in March 1963.
2 Tanjinsui (1992) p176
3 Negoro (1992) p70
4 Both figures from Negoro (1992) p72
5 Negoro (1992) p70
He has thus moved away from the position that honorific usage is, at least partially, determined by the narrator's relationship with the characters, and is instead suggesting that it, in some cases at least, is governed by the narrator's desire to express to the reader a change in the relationship between the characters, or a moment of particular emphasis in that relationship. This would make choice of honorific form by the narrator a stylistic tool, in the same way as seems to be the case for character titles.

An alternative suggestion is that where the people being described are of the same social class, then the honorifics are used to distinguish between the person performing the action and the person receiving the effect of that action. This would make honorific usage, in some cases at least, a purely pragmatic device for distinguishing between the performer and receiver of an action.

The above discussion has given some indication of the extent and nature of the debate in Japanese academic circles about their own honorific system. Let us now consider some ideas which have been proposed for the description of honorifics by Western scholars. It has been suggested that honorific language can be divided into three basic types:

1. Referent Honorifics
2. Addressee Honorifics
3. Bystander Honorifics

Taking each type in turn, referent honorifics are concerned with things or persons to which S refers. Thus S can give respect to H indirectly by either raising things

---

1 Negoro (1992) p74
2 See Chapter Four
3 増田利伸 (1976) 博士在学の飯絡の研究, 新文書出版株式会社
connected with H, or lowering things connected with S (or S’s group). Alternatively, they need not have any connection with the S-H relationship. For example, if two friends are talking about a third party, who is of high status, they may employ referent honorifics to refer to them, but would not be employing any honorifics to each other. Addressee honorifics give respect directly to H by raising their actions, or lowering S’s when they have some connection with H. Finally, bystander honorifics give respect to people present when S is addressing H but not actually taking part in the S-H dyad. Recent work has shown that referent honorifics are the most common in the world’s languages followed by addressee honorifics and finally bystander honorifics.

It is at this point that the situation becomes somewhat more complex. While the above descriptions of honorifics might seem to be fairly clear cut, when it comes to defining which type of honorifics a particular language’s honorifics belong to, there is considerable confusion. MJ speech levels are described as being addressee honorifics and also as referent honorifics in different publications and both arguments have their points. It might be that such an absolute division into specific types is inappropriate and some combination of referent and addressee honorifics might work better. Be that as it may, it is possible to make a further sub-division of either of these two types. It was mentioned above that S can either raise H or lower him/herself. These can be called subject honorifics and object honorifics or alternatively, actor and non-actor honorifics. This would seem to be a similar approach to that being taken by Negoro for Japanese as mentioned above and, indeed, this terminology can be used to describe the traditional Japanese terms for keigo. Thus, sonkeigo is equivalent to Subject Honorifics (SH); kenjōgo to Object Honorifics (OH); and teineigo to Addressee Honorifics (AH). Possibly bikago should be

---

defined as a type of bystander honorifics, although, of course, the presence of H will have some influence as well.¹ *Teichōgo* would seem to be a type of AH as well.

Given that this Japanese terminology and the Western terms mentioned do seem to correspond, it has been decided that in our discussions and analysis of honorifics in the *Genji* we will use the terms Subject Honorific (SH), Object Honorific (OH), Addressee Honorific (AH) and Bystander Honorific (BH), although occasional reference may be made to Japanese terminology where appropriate.

¹ Minami’s fifth function for honorifics would seem to be relevant here.
2.3 The Honorifics of Late Old Japanese

When we speak of LOJ we are, of course, referring to the language of the capital and the nobility and, as this is the language of the *Genji*, our main concern, we need not be concerned about the lack of information about the language of the other classes in Heian Japan. Further, we will here be concentrating on the honorifics used in the Japanese language literature of the period (*wabun*) and passing over that used in the *kanbun*.

Obviously, then, social status and rank were intimately connected with the type of honorifics which a person would use and would have used to them by others. Status in Heian Japan was strictly defined, mainly according to the system of court ranks.

This produced a rigid hierarchy as follows:

2. Heian Court Hierarchy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Emperor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Empress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Crown Prince</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other members of the Imperial family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upper Tenjōbito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lower Tenjōbito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Zuryō</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The term “level” here does not refer to actual court rank, merely to status in the hierarchy mentioned above. The Japanese terms above are difficult to translate which is why they have been left as they are. Very approximately, *kandachibe* (上達部),

---

2. Tsujimura (1992) p337
otherwise known as kugyō (公卿), were the highest ranking non-imperial nobles. They filled the great offices of state, Ministers of the Left and Right, Regent etc. and also sat on the Emperor's council. Tenjōbito (殿上人) were nobles whom the Emperor had “specifically designated as attendants or courtiers”¹ and had the right of entry into the Tenjō no ma (天上的間) the room where the Emperor spent the day and served him as messengers, guards and the like. Zuryō (受領) were a sub-group of the nobles ranking below tenjōbito and served as provincial governors for the imperial government and were often retainers to higher ranking nobles who would, of course, never have left the capital. Thus it might be possible to translate kandachibe as “Ministers” or “Councillors”, tenjōbito as “Courtiers”, and zuryō as “Retainers” or “Governors”, but as this is only an approximation it is probably better to leave them in the Japanese.

In Genji Monogatari, Kiritsubo originates in the lower end of the kandachibe class as her father was a dainagon (大納言) thus she comes from the lower ranks of the upper nobility. Her rival and tormentor, Kokiden, is the daughter of the Minister of the Right; thus while the two women are theoretically of the same class, Kokiden’s status is much higher because of her father’s more exalted rank. Fujitsubo, on the other hand, is the daughter of an Emperor so her status starts at a higher level than Kokiden’s and she eventually rises to the heights of being Empress. While the female characters’ status tends to remain fairly constant, that of the males changes during the course of the novel as their court rank changes. There are, however, other considerations at work besides rank; Genji, for example, receives a great deal of honorifics even very early on in the novel when his rank is fairly low, this is due to the fact that he is the son of an Emperor, even though he has been demoted to being a commoner. It seems that the Heian aristocrats made a distinction between two characteristics: kurawi (位) and mi (身). The former was court rank, which one gained as one rose in age or proximity to the rulers of the time. The latter was status

as defined by one's family background, and either could influence the need for honorific usage. Thus at the beginning of the *Genji*, Genji has a low *kurawi*, but a high *mi* on account of his birth, and therefore requires honorifics to be used about him.

2.3.1 The Organisation of the LOJ Honorific System

How, then, was the LOJ honorifics system organised? Like the modern one it consisted of both SH and OH forms which were used in much the same way as the modern ones are. There were, however, quite a number of differences, not only in the area of lexical choices, but also in the levels of honorifics available to a LOJ speaker.

3. Honorific Levels Available in MJ and LOJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Japanese</th>
<th>Late Old Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Hyper-Polite SH)</td>
<td>Hyper-Hyper-Polite SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Hyper-Polite SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Honorific</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>(Non-Honorific)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hyper-Polite OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hyper-polite SHs are largely obsolete in MJ so a speaker basically has a three way choice of forms to use. This was not the case in LOJ, which as can be seen from the above, had a larger number of available forms, although in some ways the choice was more restricted than in the modern language as is shown below:
4. Honorific Usage in LOJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Speaker Reference to Addressee</th>
<th>Speaker Reference to Self</th>
<th>Used to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1:</td>
<td>Hyper-Hyper Polite SH</td>
<td>Hyper-Polite OH</td>
<td>Emperor, Crown Prince and Empress only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2:</td>
<td>Hyper-Polite SH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Upper Tenjobito and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3:</td>
<td>SH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Lower Tenjobito and below</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4:</td>
<td>Non-Honorific</td>
<td>Non-Honorific</td>
<td>Equals/ Intimates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level 1 was characterised by the use of special SH words to describe actions by the subjects and hyper-polite OH terms when doing things for or to them. For example, addressing the Emperor could be described using the hyper-polite OH verb *sosu* instead of the more usual one, *kikoyu*, although the rank of the person speaking would effect the choice of level, as is shown by the following:

\[(7)\]  上にさぶらふ内侍のすけは…と奏しけるに…\(^1\)

uFe ni saburaFu naisi no suke Fa...to *sosikeryu* ni...

A Naishi no Suke who served His Majesty,... said...

\[(8)\]  女もいみじと見挙りて…と、息も絶えつ、崩えまぼしげなる事は有りげなれど…\(^2\)

wonna mo ito imiji to mitatematurite...to iki mo taetutu

*kikomen**F*osigenaru koto Fa arigemaredo...

The woman too looked (at him) helplessly...(she) said, her breath continually failing her, and though she looked as if she wanted to say more...

In the first example, the speaker is one of the Emperor’s servants and so a hyper-polite OH verb was chosen by the narrator. In the second case the speaker is Kiritsubo and so the less polite verb, *kikoyu*, has been chosen, although it should perhaps be noted that this refers only to her stated desire to speak, her actual speech has been marked only with the quotative particle and left verbless.

The position is perhaps clearer with regard to hyper-hyper-polite SH usage.

There were various specific vocabulary items, both verbs and nouns, which could be

---

\(^1\) Imaizumi et al (1976) p13
\(^2\) Imaizumi et al (1976) p4
applied to individuals with extremely high status. Thus, a visit by the Empress or Crown Prince would be described with the term gyaukei (行啇), while that of an Emperor was described with the special word miyuki (行幸), or alternatively gyaugau (行幸), rather than anything else.

With regard to the formation of honorific verb forms in LOJ, there were five jodōshi (助動詞) used to indicate an SH. These were -su, -sasu, -simu, -ru and -raru. To all intents and purposes, however, these five jodōshi can be treated as three, as the difference between -su and -sasu and -ru and -raru was not one of meaning but of the verb conjugations to which they could be attached.² The -ru and -raru suffixes are the origin of the modern passive and the passive SH. The other three have causative meanings in addition to their SH one, but -simu was used almost entirely in kanbun so we will not deal further with it here. It is easy to see how these suffixes developed an SH meaning: important people were not felt to do things themselves, they had other people do them. In addition there was a verb, tamaFu, which was added to the end of a construction to indicate an SH. Research has shown that, in fact, the structure: verb+tamaFu was the most commonly used form of SH in LOJ,³ and that its range of usage was somewhat wider than strictly SH, given that it could also be used to express respect to hogo, a term which is translated as “complement” and is used to refer to elements of a sentence such as the agent of a passive verb.⁴

These various suffixes could be combined to create SH expressions of varying degrees of respect. In MJ it is no longer possible in the normal run of things to use a causative to indicate respect, apart from in contexts such as:

(9) 私がこの荷物を持たせていただきます。
Watashi ga kono nimotsu o motasete itadakimasu
I will carry this bug.

although it literally means:

---

¹ An inflecting suffix adding the senses of 'honorific', 'tense', 'mood' etc. to the main verb. Sometimes translated as 'auxiliary verb'.
² This analysis corresponds with the traditional Japanese one. A more precise linguistic approach, however, would consider -ru/raru and -su/sasu as allomorphs, and not distinct forms in their own right.
³ Waragai Takasumi (1989) Ch. 4 Chūjō no Keigo (Late Old and Middle Honorifics) (Kyōiku Shuppan Sensta) p34
The bag in question might well actually belong to the speaker and the expression is used to fend off well meaning attempts to carry it by the addressee politely. Whether this is actually an SH usage is open to debate, one that is not, however, is *dearaseraremash*, the special honorific copula used on signs in the Shrine at Ise to refer to the gods. This is clearly a combination of both passive and causative in an SH meaning, but it may well be the only remaining MJ example of this type.

In essence, then, there were three possible levels of SH in LOJ:

5. **SH Levels in LOJ**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb+(sa)su+tamaFu</th>
<th>Hyper-Polite SH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Verb+tamaFu</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb+(ra)ru</td>
<td>SH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

although the difference in politeness between the two lower levels was probably marginal.\(^1\) Tamagami Takuya has proposed\(^2\) a slightly different arrangement of honorific levels:

6. **Honorific Levels in LOJ according to Tamagami (1959)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Vocabulary</th>
<th>最高敬語</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>notamaFasu, tamaFasu</em> etc.</td>
<td><em>Saikō keigo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Highest honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb+(sa)su+tamaFu</td>
<td>二重敬語</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Nijū keigo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Second level honorifics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb+(ra)ru/tamaFu</td>
<td>最低敬語</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Saitei keigo</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest honorifics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tamagami claims that the usage of both *saikō keigo* and *nijū keigo* is restricted to highest members of the imperial family, specifically Emperor, Empress, Crown Prince and Retired Emperor, with *saitei keigo* being used for people of all other ranks.

This is, in fact, inaccurate, as Tsujimura notes that of the 93 usages of *nijū keigo* in

---

\(^1\) See Morino (1971) p135 for a discussion of this point.

\(^2\) Tamagami Takuya (1959) "Genji Monogatari no Keigohō", *Kou Kaisaku to Bunpo 3* (Rules for Honorifics in the Genji Monogatari in A Course in Interpretation and Grammar 3) quoted in Tsujimura (1992) p349
the Murasaki Shikibu Nikki, approximately one third are used in reference to Fujiwara Michinaga. He speculates that this is due to Michinaga’s position as father to the empress. Whichever division of honorifics is chosen, LOJ speakers would, depending upon the context and the status of their addressees, choose one of these levels of respect and use them in their speech.

In addition to the regular SHs, however, there were also suppletive forms. For simplicity’s sake, suppletive OH forms will be included in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Irregular SH and OH LOJ Verb Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(from)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table though, needs some comment and explanation. These verbs did not spring into existence at the beginning of the LOJ period and then suddenly cease to exist after it, there was a long, slow period of change and not all the verbs mentioned here were used throughout it. Other verbs are only attested by a few examples in the

---

1 Tsujimura (1992) p350
2 Occasional usage only.
3 Early LOJ period only. Gradually became shirasetamaFaru.
4 There are only a few examples of both these verbs in this usage.
classical canon and so it is not possible to say exactly how widespread their usage was.

Where there are blanks in the table, it is to be supposed that the relevant forms were either non-existent or regular. For example, the SH forms of ‘see’ and ‘hear’ were mitamaFu (見給ふ) and kikitamaFu (聞き給ふ) respectively. Moreover, it is not to be supposed that where more than one possibility is given, the two words were interchangeable, often context was important. Thus oFosu (仰す) was not used when high ranking persons were engaging in conversation, only when they were giving orders to subordinates, conversation was marked by oFosetamaFu (仰せ給ふ).

Where OH speech was concerned, mausu (申す) was very rarely used by women at all, they were much more likely to use kikoesasu (聞えさす) instead, although this was a marker of extreme deference; in the Genji it is only used when people are addressing the Emperor, other members of the Imperial family or Genji himself. It also seems that there was a distinction in LOJ between public and private speaking, with mausu tending to be confined to the public arena and only occurring very rarely when people are speaking privately.

Regular OH forms were formed by the addition of one of a number of OH verbs to the action verb in question. The most commonly used were -kikoyu (-聞ゆ) and -tatematuru (-奉る), although -mausu (-申す), -mawirasu (-参らず) and -kikoesasu (聞えさす) were all used occasionally as well and an L2 conjugation verb -tamaFu (-給ふ) was also used as an OH marker. This verb, in particular, seems to have been short-lived, as it does not occur in Old Japanese, is rare in later Heian works and has disappeared from usage by the time of the writing of the Heike Monogatari in the late twelfth century.¹ It seems that the type of action would often determine the verb used: -kikoyu being used for “verbs which express mental functions” (心の働きを表す動詞 (kokoro no hataraki o arawasu dōshi))² and -tatematuru for “verbs which express basic actions” (具体的な動作を表す動詞)

¹ Tsujimura (1992) pp354-355
² Tsujimura (1992) p565
for example, sight or entering a place. The latter was the older usage so -kikoyu was probably considered a more fashionable and stylish usage at court at the time of the *Genji*’s writing. After the latter half of the eleventh century it vanished in this usage to be replaced by -mawirasu, so speech at court did undergo fairly rapid changes in fashionable speech.

Another common way of expressing deference was to use euphemistic expressions, for example, the mawiru element in *migusimawiru* (御髪参る) “do (a superior’s) hair”, this emphasised the motion to the superior, rather than the action itself, which was fairly commonplace. Another example:

\[(11) \text{suzakuin yori watarimawireru biFu, koto} \]

*Koto* and *biwa* which had been sent (to *Genji*) from the Suzaku palace.

### 2.3.2 Differences between the LOJ and MJ Honorific Systems

It is often considered that one of the major changes between the LOJ honorific system and the modern one has been a shift away from an “absolute” (*zettaitaru*) system to a “relative” (*sotaitaru*) one. What this means is that supposedly, in Heian Japanese, the social statuses of the speaker and addressee were the primary factors in determining the level of honorific usage, whereas now the speaker’s perception of his relationship with the addressee is more important, regardless of what their absolute statuses may be. Thus any Heian noble, knowing the rank of the person he was speaking to would know immediately what level of honorific to employ. Theoretically this would mean that the Emperor, being at the top of the hierarchy, would not have to use honorifics to anyone. In fact this is not the case, it seems that other factors besides rank did enter into honorific usage, although maybe not to the extent that they do now, Emperors did use honorifics, particularly if

---

1. Tsujimura (1992) p365
3. From *Genji Monogatari*, Wakana-Jō chapter, quoted in Morino (1971) p144
4. Morino (1971)
they were conscious of owing a debt to someone.\(^1\) Moreover, there is some evidence that the system was not completely absolute, in that honorifics did not have to be used in all contexts. A good example comes from the *Genji*: when Kokiden finds out that Genji has been having an affair with her sister, Oborozukiyo, and has actually been discovered in her bed, she flies into a rage and tells her father in no uncertain terms that something must be done about Genji. When referring to him she does not use any honorifics, although his rank would entitle him to it and she does use it on other occasions, so it seems that extremes of emotion could override the absolute honorific system.\(^2\) Another example would be in the *Momiji no Ga* chapter of the *Genji*, when Shōnagon, one of Murasaki’s women, says to her:\(^3\)

\[
\text{(12)  かく御夫などままけ奉りたまひては、あるべかししめやかにてこそ見え奉らせ給はめ。}^4
\]

\[
\text{kaku oFon-wotoko nado maaketatematuritamaFite Fa , arubekasiu simeyakanite koso, mietatematurasetamaFige.}
\]

...having such a husband you should behave more appropriately and quietly.

She is here applying a higher level of honorific (-*setama*Fa-) to Murasaki than to Genji (-*tatematura*-), in spite of the fact that Genji’s rank and status, as a man and son of an emperor, would have been higher than Murasaki’s, as the daughter of a prince and only a child. This is explained by the fact that Murasaki is Shōnagon’s mistress and she would have felt, therefore, that she deserved the highest level of respect. Thus if honorific usage in the *Genji* is an accurate representation of actual usage in Heian Japan, then the system could not have been totally dependent upon absolute social status. There is other evidence to suggest that by the time of the *Genji*’s writing, relative honorific usage had become part of the language more generally, although it was regarded as unpleasant.\(^5\)

---

2. This example is taken from Morino (1971) p.11.
3. This example and the subsequent explanation are taken from Wataki (1989) pp.46-47.
4. Imazumi et al. (1976) p130.
Nevertheless, in spite of these provisos, it is fair to say that the LOJ honorifics system in general was absolute. There were also other differences from the modern one, some of which are a reflection of the difference between the two societies. For example it was commonplace for people to use honorifics to the servants of high ranking nobles, or even to their pets, as is shown by the incident in the *Makura no Sōshi* when the Emperor's cat goes outside the palace blinds and is told by one of the ladies in waiting to *iritamaFe*, an honorific imperative. Furthermore, servants would use SH terms about their own actions if they were undertaken at the behest of their master or mistress and the master would give instructions to the servant using OH expressions to describe the servant's actions. For example:

(13) ただいま前光の朝臣の宿る所にまかりて、急ぎ参るべき用いて
* tadaima koremitu no ason no yadoreru tokoro ni *makarite* isogi
mawaru beki yosi iFe

Go to the place where Koremitsu is staying and say there is a reason he must *come* at once.

Genji is here giving an order to one of his bodyguards, as the underlined words in the Japanese are AH verbs for travelling to and from a superior.

Another common feature of LOJ honorifics which has vanished completely from the modern language is the mixture of OH and SH forms. If someone of high rank was doing something in some way connected with another person of high rank, the action might be expressed by an OH verb to show respect to the other person, but then an SH might be added on to show respect to the person actually doing the action. One very brief example:

(14) いとうよう似給へり」と、内侍のすけの聞えけるを、若き御心地に、いと哀れと思ひ聞え給ひて...
* itou you nitamaFeri to naisi no suke no kikoekeru wo wakaki
oFon kokoti ni ito aFare to omoFikoFotamaFite...

---

1 See 池田喜雄, 岡田秋夫 (1988) 日本古典文学大系 19: 枚の草紙, 岩波書店, p52
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p76
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p13-14
The Naishi no Suke1 had said, “She resembles [your mother] greatly,” and in his youthful heart he felt [Fujitsubo] was wonderful...

This brief extract from the *Genji* concerns Genji the child’s feelings for his father’s new wife, Fujitsubo. As she is of high rank, the verb describing Genji’s feelings for her, *omoFu* “think/feel”, is made humble by the addition of the underlined OH auxiliary, *kikoyu*. Genji, though, is the son of an Emperor and himself of high rank so the boldfaced SH auxiliary, *tamaFu* is added. Thus without a subject the clause tells the reader who is doing the feeling and about whom, purely through honorifics.

2.3.3 The Honorific Verbs *Faberi* and *saburaFu*

LOJ had the honorific verbs *Faberi* (待り) and *saburaFu* (候ふ) which are often described as *teineigo*, however, it seems that they were not used in the same way as *MJ desu* and *-mas(u)*, so it cannot be said that there was a ‘polite style’ in LOJ. While *Faberi* does occur with both SH and OH forms, it is rare with SHs and only seldom used in second person reference. Its original meaning was something like *osorekashikomaru*1 or “at your service” and it seems that it graduated from being used in letters to indicate that the writer was at the disposal of the recipient to a more general spoken politeness marker, but still retained fairly ‘humble’ overtones.

Perhaps an example will make its usage clear. In the *Yadorigi* chapter of the *Genji*, a nun is talking to Kaoru, who wants her to relay a message to Ukifune. The nun says:

\[(15)\] さばば、しかたへ待ちやむ  
*saraba, sika tutaFeFaberamu*  
If that’s the case I’ll tell her it.

and later:

\[(16)\] つたへ聞えさせん  
*tutaFekikosesasen*3  
I’ll tell you.

The second example is clearly a regular OH form, but what of the other? The nun’s telling Ukifune will be nothing to do with Kaoru and the nun’s status is not different

---

1 This phrase denotes a type of Imperial servant.  
2 Morino (1971) p152  
3 Both examples are quoted in Morino (1971) p154 and the following argument is also his.
from Ukifune’s, so an OH form would not be expected. Why then is she using Faberi? Might it not be because she is conscious of Kaoru’s presence and feels that plain tutaFemu would be rather abrupt with such an exalted person there? If this is the case, then it is a type of bystander honorific. Another argument is that she is using it in its ‘service’ sense, as she will be undertaking the action at his request. In any case it is clear that this is not the same as -masu, she does not say tutaFekikoFesaseFaberamu, which one would expect if it were.

The other ‘polite’ verb, saburaFu “serve”, continued in its original meaning for some time, only becoming an honorific auxiliary at the end of the tenth century. It was not commonly used in this way until the middle of the eleventh century, however, where it still tended to be limited to male speech until the twelfth century, when it replaced Faberi. It has been noted that while these verbs are usually categorised as teineigo, in some respects their usage would seem closer to that of modern bikago.\(^1\) Alternatively, the modern desu/masu style and LOJ Faberi/saburaFu have been described as taisha keigo (対者敬語), “honorifics for people” and tawa keigo (対話敬語), “honorifics for speech” respectively.\(^2\) Indicating that for modern desu/masu usage the key determining factor is the personal relationship between S and H, whereas other factors in the discourse influenced the usage of Faberi and saburaFu. It is perhaps worth mentioning that while Faberi ceased to be used as an AH expression in the twelfth century, it did not pass out of use altogether, as is shown by the fact that it was used by Bashō in works such as Oku no Hosomichi in order to convey “an air of classical elegance” (古雅なニュアンス (kogana nyuansu)).\(^3\) This would seem to be fulfilling Minami’s sixth function of honorifics mentioned earlier.\(^4\)

\(^1\) Tsujimura (1992) pp348-349
\(^2\) Tsujimura (1992) p285
\(^3\) Tsujimura (1992) p293
\(^4\) See Section 2.2
2.4 Honorifics in the *Genji Monogatari*

Now that we have given an overview of the honorific systems of both MJ and LOJ we are in a position to consider how honorifics were actually used in the text of the *Genji* to identify characters. The contention that the Japanese language’s resources of honorifics functioned to identify characters, identification which would be made by an explicit subject or object in English, has been made before, most notably by Tanizaki Jun’ichirō. In a discussion on how it is possible to identify Genji and his retainer in a passage from *Utsusemi*, he says:

...何でさうふの形、一つが従者の動作であり、一つが主家の動作であるが、何故で分るかと申しますと、敬語の形はもしくは使い方に分るのではあります。1

...nan de sauifu kubetsu ga tsuka ka, hitotsu ga genji no dosa deari, hitotsu ga jusha no dosu dearu koto ga, naze de wakaru ka to moshiemasu to, kego no doshi moshikuwa jodoshi no tsukahikata de wakaru no dearimasu.

How is this distinction made, that one action is Genji’s and one is his retainer’s? How can one tell? One can tell from the usage of honorific verbs and auxiliaries.

Further support comes from Minami, where in reference to his fourth function of honorifics, the provision of information about actual conditions (実質的情報の受け渡し (*jishitsuteki jōhō no ukewatashi*)), he remarks:

日本語の尊敬語、謙譲語などの要素が使われている場合には、動作主や被動作主を明示することばがなくても、だれが（だれに）なにをする（される）かがわからないことが多いしばしばある。2

*Nihongo no sonkeigo, kenjōgo nado no yōso ga tsukawaretiru baai ni wa, dosashu ya hidōshu o metisuru koto ga nakatemo, dare ga (dare ni) nani o suru (sereru) kā ga wakatteshimau koto ga shibashiba aru.*

In cases where Japanese honorific, humble, etc. elements are used, even when there are not words which clarify the actor and recipient, one often understands who does what (to whom).

---

He goes on to note that this function is used most strongly in the Japanese classics, his example being the Genji Monogatari. Another scholar has even gone so far as to say:

All of these authors, therefore, seem to be supporting our theory that honorifics in the Genji were used pragmatically for character identification.

In order to demonstrate that this is indeed the case, it has been decided to study a passage from the Genji in some detail, paying special attention to the honorifics in order to show how they are used by the author to identify the various characters to which she refers. The passage chosen comes from Kiritsubo, the Genji's first chapter and covers the introduction of Fujitsubo into the lives of Genji and his father the Emperor. Due to the length of LOJ sentences, we will be obliged to deal with the passage in short sections.

2.4.1 Analysis of a Passage of Text

年月に添へて、御息所の御事を思い知る、折なし。

---

1 Mirami (1977) p39
2 Waragai (1989) p33
4 See Endnote 1 for a description of the terminology used in the analysis of this passage.
Months and years passed and there was no time when (the Emperor) forgot the Prince’s mother.

The passage comes directly after a section where the Emperor, with regret, has decided to make Genji a commoner as he does not have enough backing at court to survive as an imperial prince. The sentence quoted above starts a new paragraph in some modern texts, but of course this is a decision made by the editors and would not have been the case in the original manuscript due to the Heian convention of not using punctuation in texts and only pausing for poems or at the end of chapters. There are two honorific elements in this sentence: the prefix ofon- attached to the noun koto, and the SH verb obosiwasuru. OFon- is used because the noun to which it is attached refers to Kiritsubo, but she is mentioned explicitly as miyasudokoro. The use of obosiwasuru, however, does identify the Emperor. It indicates that someone of high rank is the subject, and considering that the preceding text has been about the Emperor, he is the obvious choice.

1 In order to assist in the identification of honorific forms, they have been underlined in the text, and the element in the translation which most closely corresponds with them has been underlined to give some idea of the prevalence of honorific forms in LOJ.
He summoned suitable people, thinking they might be able to console him, but he felt it was a hard world with no one he could even think of as comparable to her, and he came to find everything depressing...

This section contains three honorifics, two of which, obosu and obosinaru are SH verbs referring to mental processes. As previously, context and the fact that they are SH, indicate that the subject can only be the Emperor. The third is the verb mawirasetamaFu, a compound of the AH verb mawiru, “travel to a superior”, the causative particle -su and the SH honorific marker -tamaFu. Thus the compound indicates that someone of low rank was made to come to someone of high rank, by someone of high rank. The people obliged to come are clearly marked with sarubeki hitobito but the subject is not, again context and the honorific indicate that it must be the Emperor.

先帝の四の宮の、御かたりすぐれ給へる聞え高くおはします母
後世にくかしき聞え給ふを

sendai no si no miya no oFon- katati sugure
previous P 4 P princess SUB SH- form excel
emperor

-tamaFe -ru kikoe takaku -oFasimasu FaFakisaki yo
-SH -T reputation be high -SH mother world
empress

naku kasiduki -kikoe -tamaFu wo
in be not raise -OH -SH CONJ

The fourth daughter of the previous Emperor was beautiful, had a good reputation and had been raised with great care by her mother...

Here we have a new subject introduced: sendai no si no miya, Fujitsubo, and most of the honorifics refer to her. Again we have the use of oFon- to modify the noun katati and the auxiliaries -tamaFu and -oFasimasu used to make SH expressions of the non-honorific suguru and takasi. Also we have the combination of both SH and OH auxiliaries in the verb kasidukikikoetamaFu. This is a combination of the verb kasiduku, “raise/bring up”, the OH verb kikoyu and the SH one tamaFu. The subject here is Fujitsubo’s mother, FaFakisaki, but the honorifics serve to mark the object, Fujitsubo. Kikoyu indicates that the person being brought up is someone of
high rank, and *tamaFu* that the person doing the raising is someone of high rank as well. Given that the subject is marked, the object can only be Fujitsubo.

A Naishi no Suke who served the Emperor, being a person of the last reign, had been used to serving the Princess and so had seen her since she was a child and even now saw her occasionally, said to the Emperor, "In three reign’s service, I have seen no one who resembles my dead lady, but the daughter of the old Empress really looks like her as she grows up. She really is beautiful,"…

In this section we have our first passage of directly quoted speech. As the Naishi is a servant, it is not surprising that she uses quite a large amount of honorifics.
References to Kiritsubo are marked with -tamaFu and once oFon-. The one reference to Fujitsu, on the other hand is given a higher level of honorific, using the SH jodoshi -sasu, and -tamaFu as well. She also uses the OH auxiliary, -tatematuru, with the verb miru, “see”, to indicate that she is the person doing the seeing. This follows the narrator’s usage in the passage immediately prior to the Naishi’s speech. The narrator also uses the SH auxiliary -oFasimasu to mark the adjective iFakenasi as referring to Fujitsu. Finally one should note the use of the ultra-polite OH verb sousu to describe the Naishi’s speech. This indicates that the speech is actually to the Emperor directly as it can only be used of speech to someone of the highest rank.

He wondered if it could be true and communicated with her very politely. The lady’s mother was concerned, thinking, “What a worry, the mother of the Crown Prince is very ill-natured and there’s also the unfortunate example of the Lady Kiritsubo; openly treated so cruelly...”; she had still not decided when she too died.

The first sentence in this section refers to the Emperor’s thoughts upon hearing of Fujitsu from the Naishi. Two verbs are used but with different levels of
politeness. The first, *kokorotomaru* is made honorific by the addition of *oFon-* whereas the second is more complex, being the OH verb *kikoyu* with the SH auxiliaries *-sasu* and *tamaFu* added. This is possibly because the action, communicating with Fujitsubo’s mother, involves two people of high rank. *Kikoyu* indicates that the subject is communicating with someone of high rank, and the presence of the double SH afterwards identifies that subject as the Emperor. On the other hand, it is possible that *-sasu* is being used for its causative sense, and the verb should thus be interpreted as “He had someone communicate with her”, but the former interpretation is perhaps more likely.

The second part of this section deals with Fujitsubo’s mother’s reaction to the Emperor’s proposal. As she is identified at the beginning of the section with *FaFakisaki no*,¹ she is clearly the subject of the following honorific verbs, *obositutumu* and *obositatu*. This is emphasised by the fact that she is re-identified in the final clause as the subject of *usu*, “die”, which has *-tamaFu* affixed to it.

¹ The particle *no* is not present in some texts.
When the lady was quite desolate, the Emperor communicated very politely, saying, “I will think of her just like one of my own daughters.” Her servants, backers and brother, Prince Hyōbukyo, came to think that rather than being so sad she should be made to go to court, where she should be consoled, and sent her off. She was called Fujitsubo.

This section refers to two characters who have already been introduced, Fujitsubo and the Emperor; and also a group of new ones, Fujitsubo’s servants, backers and elder brother. While the latter group is explicitly stated, the former two are identified mainly by the honorifics used. For Fujitsubo, we see further use of the SH verb oFasimasu to make the adjective kokorobososi honorific. This verb was used some lines previously, again with reference to Fujitsubo, and it does not seem improbable that it is being used here to identify her. Other identification comes from the use of the SH auxiliary -tamaFu to indicate that the person who should find comfort at court and was sent off was of high rank, but note also the use of OH tatematuru and mawiru to indicate that she was being sent to someone of higher rank.

The Emperor is only the subject of one brief phrase, but it is clearly him speaking because, as previously, both the SH auxiliaries -sasu and -tamaFu are used to modify the OH verb kikoyu, thus indicating that someone of very high rank is communicating with someone else of high rank. Incidentally, it is worth noting the Emperor’s speech here. He uses the OH verb omoFikikoyu to describe his own thoughts, thus demonstrating that even the person at the pinnacle of the Heian rank structure used honorifics when necessary.
In fact, her form and appearance were to a remarkable extent the way he remembered. This lady was of high rank and beautiful beyond what he had thought possible, as people could not despise her, he could dote on her to his heart’s content. With the other lady he had not been free and his feelings had been most unfortunate. Although he did not become so wrapped up in his new love as to forget her, naturally his affections shifted and as he found special comfort, it really was quite something.

This section is about Fujitsubo and the Emperor’s reactions upon seeing her, and both people seem to be given approximately the same level of honorific usage. The Emperor’s feelings are identified by oFon- as are Fujitsubo’s appearance and status. Both receive tamaFu, but the Emperor’s thoughts and the like are continually described using the SH obosu, usually as part of a compound verb describing some kind of mental process or emotion. Interestingly, there is one phrase, ukebarite akanu koto nashi, “he doted on her to his heart’s content”, of which the Emperor is the subject, but contains no honorifics. Possibly this is because the phrase is meant to recollect an earlier use of akazu in reference to Kiritsubo, where the Emperor finds her an akazu aFare naru mono, “a greatly moving person”, and consequently

---

1 Inouzumi et al (1976) p1
honorifics were not felt to be necessary. Reference to a *Genji Monogatari* variorum edition, however, shows that in one of the *Beppon* texts, this passage does, in fact, read *ukebaritamaFite akanu koto nasi* which would seem to make more sense. On the other hand, where many texts say one thing and only one says another, it is the majority that are more likely to be correct.

Fujitsubo can also be identified as the object of the verb *otosimu*, 'despise', as a result of the honorifics attached to it. It has the OH auxiliary *kikoyu* as well as the SH one *tamaFu*. The verb's subject, 'people', are court nobles so, of course, they deserve respect, however, the presence of the OH auxiliary shows that the action they are carrying out is to someone of even higher rank, who can only be Fujitsubo.

---

1  — (1941) Yaichi (1941) *Genji Monogatari* (Variorum Genji Monogatari) Chuo Koran Sha), p.23
Genji never left his father's side and the lady to whom the Emperor went most often, could not behave like a stranger to him. Was it really the case that all the other ladies thought they were inferior? Although each was splendid in her way, they were all older, while Fujitsubo was very young and beautiful and though she hid most attractively, he occasionally glimpsed her. He only remembered a trace of his mother, and the Naishi no Suke had said to him, "She really resembles her," so in his young heart he thought she wonderful and he always wanted to be with her and he felt it would be wonderful if only he saw her all the time.

Here we have the introduction of the third of our protagonists, Genji, and a description of his reactions to Fujitsubo. Honorifics are used quite subtly, to identify the major characters, while minor ones are mentioned explicitly. The Emperor's one action in this section, going to see Fujitsubo, is clearly his because of the presence of the double SH form -setamaFu modifying the verb in question, wataru. Fujitsubo's action, hiding her face, has only -tamaFu, although she is identified as the object of Genji's thoughts and desires by the use of tatematuru, kikoyu and mawiru.

Genji himself is mentioned explicitly at the beginning of the section but thereafter is identified with honorifics: SH oFon- to modify his feelings and tamaFu to modify his actions. He is also identified as the person to whom the Naishi no Suke is talking by the use of OH kikoyu for "to say". She cannot be speaking to the Emperor here, because that would require sousu instead, and if she had been talking to another servant then iFu would have done for her speech. As in the previous section there is an expression, morimitatematuru, which one would expect to have a SH
attached to it as Genji is the subject. As before, reference to a variorum edition reveals that there is some doubt over this passage. Both Beppon and Kawachi-bon texts have SH tamaFu following mitatematuru, and one even has mitatematurasetamFu, although as this would suggest that it is actually the Emperor who is looking at Fujitsubo, which does not make sense in the context, it should probably be considered an error.

---

uFe mo kagirinaku oFon- omoidoti ni -te na- utomi
emperor too extremely SH- friend be -T NEG- dislike
-tamaFu -so ayasiku yosoFe -tu -beki kokoti
-SH -IMPERATIVE be strange remind -T -must feelings
nan suru namesi to oboSu -de nautasi -tamaFe
P(EMPH) so rude Q (think-SH) -NEG be pleasant -SH
turatuki mami nado Fa ito you ni -tari -si
face eyes etc THE very well resemble -T -T
tyuwe kayoFi -te mie -tamaFu mo nigenakara
reason back and forth -T be able to see -SH too be unsuitable
-zu nan nado kikoetuke -tamaFe -re -ba
-NEG P(EMPH) Q (instruct-OH) -SH -T as
wosanakokoti ni mo Fakanaki Fana momiji nituketomo
young feelings P too ordinary flowers leaves with
kokorozasi wo mie -tatematuri koyonau kokoroyose
feelings OBJ be able to see -OH particular have interest
-kike -tamaFe -re -ba kokiden no nyauGo mata kono miya
-OH -SH -T -as kokiden no nyauGo again this princess
to mo oFon- naka sobasobaski yuwe utisoFe
with too SH- relationship be bitter reason carry along
-te moto yori no nikusa mo tattide -te monosi to
-T before from P dislike too stand out -T collossal Q

---

1 Haga (1941) p23
When the Emperor too, said, "Be a good friend to him, and don't think badly of him. You remind me strangely of his mother. Don't think it an impertinence, care for him. As your face and appearance is so like hers, it's not unsuitable for you to look at each other..." and so on, in the child's heart ordinary blossoms and autumn leaves showed his feelings and, when he showed such a particular affection, the Lady Kokiden, as she had bitter relations with the Princess, on top of that, her previous hatred burst out and she felt it most strongly.

Here we have the Emperor telling Fujitsubo that she should care for Genji, Genji's feelings for her and the effect this has on Kokiden. The Emperor's speech is directly quoted, and the subject *uFe* at the beginning leaves no doubt that it is him speaking. The lack of honorifics in the sentence about Fujitsubo's resemblance to Kiritsubo tells a reader that the Emperor is talking about himself here, as opposed to Genji. It might be thought strange that he would use honorifics about his own son, but note that later on he says *kayoFitemietamaFu*, 'you can look at each other', using the SH auxiliary, where Genji is definitely the subject together with Fujitsubo. After the Emperor's speech, when the subject shifts to Genji, he is not explicitly mentioned, but the phrase *wosanakikoti*, 'childlike feelings', is a fairly clear indication of a subject change. When the subject shifts to Kokiden she is clearly mentioned and given the appropriate level of respect with *oFon-* for her relations with Fujitsubo and *obosu* for the dislike she feels for Genji.
The Emperor thought them beyond compare; the beauty of the famous Princess and his sparkling beauty was so incomparably marvellous that people called him the Shining Prince. As Fujitsubo matched him in the Emperor’s affections, they called her Princess Glittering Sunshine.

Finally in this passage we have a serious difference of interpretation. Many translators see the subject of the first sentence as being Kokiden, and the object as being her own children. It would thus be translated as:

She thought her children beyond compare, but even the appearance of her famous son could not compare with Genji’s sparkling beauty, seeming so beautiful that people called him the Shining Prince.

The sentence has no subject stated so one must rely upon other resources to identify who is being described, principally the honorifics.

The first honorific verb, mitatematuritama, tells us that someone of high rank is seeing someone else of high rank and that is all. There is a particularly wide variety of alternate texts for this passage, ranging from mitatematuri, which suggests that the person doing the seeing is not of a high rank, to mitatematurasetama, identifying the Emperor as the subject much more clearly. Following this seemingly ambiguous passage, however, we have the phrase natakauoFasuru miya, ‘famous Prince(ss)’, the word miya being capable of being used about people of either sex. This too would seem to be ambiguous but, earlier we have had reference made to Fujitsubo’s good reputation and high rank. Might not this phrase be intended to recall this and so make it clear that it is she who is being referred to here? If this is the case then the previous phrase is much more likely to have the Emperor as a subject than Kokiden, as we have just been told how much she dislikes Genji and Fujitsubo, she is not going to be thinking flattering thoughts about them. Once this is established then the rest of the translation falls into place, Genji is introduced with niFasasa, a

---

1 Seidensticker, Waley, Suematsu and Yosano Akiko
recurrent reference to his shining beauty, and the *oFonobo* in which Fujitsubo rivals him can only be the Emperor's.

The above analysis demonstrates the crucial role that honorifics played in character identification by indicating the relative ranks of the people involved in the actions being described. We have also seen some signs that particular characters may have been "tagged" with particular honorific verbs in order to make identifying them easier, as in the case of Fujitsubo and *oFasimasu*. It is not clear, however, whether this was done for any length of text greater than a paragraph, and this is the question which it is proposed to investigate next.

2.4.2 "Tagging" of Characters with Honorific Verbs

In order to investigate this question it was decided to follow the character of Fujitsubo through a number of chapters in the *Genji* and to examine the SHs used about her, and for comparison, those about Genji and the Emperor as she interacts with them. This should show us if any particular honorifics are used exclusively about any one character. The preliminary corpus of text is all of her appearances in the novel up until the point where she becomes Empress at the end of *Momiji no Ga*.1

The analysis used was as follows: all of the SH forms used about the three characters in question were noted and then counted to show the number of uses of each particular form about each particular character. The results for the entire corpus are presented in table form below:

---

8. Results of Survey of SH Forms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Fujitsubo</th>
<th>Genji</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oFon-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tamaFu</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sasetamaFu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-setamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasimasu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ohosu</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omohosu</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goranzu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, the results would seem to show that there is no consistent marking of one character with a particular honorific form for identification purposes. The fact that the vast majority of -tamaFu uses are about Genji is explained by the fact that, as he is the protagonist, his actions are described much more than those of the other two characters. In fact, it seems that the only SH forms which are certain character identifiers are the “special vocabulary” items, those reserved specifically to describe actions by the Emperor. Even the double honorific usage -setamaFu which might be considered to point towards him alone is not exclusively his. Moreover, the situation here is complicated somewhat by the jodōshi’s double causative and honorific meaning; there are additional occurrences of -setamaFu in the text which have been discounted as honorifics because their causative meaning was felt to be stronger. For example:

(17) FaFa miyasudokoro no oFon- katagata no Fitobito maka
mother mother of P SH- people P people (go-OH)

-tia tira -zu saburaFa -se -tamaFu sato no tono
-NEG scatter -NEG serve -CAUSE -SH village P house

Fa [...] ninau aratemetukura -se -tamaFu
THE second to none repair -CAUSE -SH

1 Inuiizumi et al (1976) p16, 116-p17,11
His mother's retinue had not departed and dispersed, and the Emperor had them serve Genji. As for his Grandmother's house, [...] the Emperor had it restored second to none.

In both of these cases the meaning was felt to be as it is given in the translation, it would not make sense for the Emperor to be serving Genji personally, nor would he be repairing the house himself, thus the auxiliary here must be causative and not honorific.

To return to our point though, it would seem that there is no evidence that characters are "tagged" with particular honorifics throughout the novel. If we examine the figures for particular excerpts, as opposed to the whole sample, however, we can achieve slightly different results. In the first excerpt, we have the usage of oFasimasu with regard to Fujitsubo, as has been discussed before:

9. SH Forms in Excerpt 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Fujitsubo</th>
<th>Genji</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oFon-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tamaFu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sasetamaFu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-setamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasimasu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obosu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omohosu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goranzu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and throughout the following three excerpts, we see a fairly consistent pattern of marking Genji with oFasu.
10. SH Forms in Excerpt 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Fujitsubo</th>
<th>Genji</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oFon-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sasetamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-setamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasimasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obosu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omohosu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goranzu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(18) wosanski Fodo no oFon- Fitogokoro ni kakari -te ito
kurusiki made zo oFasi -keru¹
painful as far as P(EMPH) (be-SH) -T

She was his youthful obsession, and it went so far as to cause him great pain.

11. SH Forms in Excerpt 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Fujitsubo</th>
<th>Genji</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oFon-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tamaFu</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-sasetamaFu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-setamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasimasu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obosu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omohosu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goranzu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Imaizumi et al (1976) p16, 110-11
At home, he lay down in tearful sleep... He did not even go to the palace and when he had been in seclusion for two or three days...

12. SH Forms in Excerpt 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honorific</th>
<th>Fujitsubo</th>
<th>Genji</th>
<th>Emperor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oFon-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tamaFu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-susetamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-setamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasimasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-oFasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obosu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omohosu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goranzu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mesu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notamaFu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Vocab.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

He too was always there...

When Genji was there...

---

1 Imazumi et al. (1976) p108, 11-3
2 Imazumi et al. (1976) p148, 12-3
3 Imazumi et al. (1976) p148, 17
4 Imazumi et al. (1976) p148, 19
When he was at his wife’s house...

Hearing that Genji was there...

The above examples would seem to suggest that, to a certain extent, “tagging” was practiced. It was not used in isolation, however, but perhaps only in conjunction with other methods of character identification. Note that of the seven examples of oFasu usage, three have explicitly stated subjects, and another has a phrase, wosanaki oFon-hitoegokoro which can only refer to Genji. Nevertheless, it would seem that it was usual to keep particular honorifics for some characters within certain limits, and this would certainly have aided in character identification.

---

1 Imazumi et al (1976) p118, 115
2.5 Rank and Subject Reference

It is a well known fact that it is only the lower ranking characters in the Genji Monogatari who have personal names, the others having titles or nicknames if anything. In this section it is proposed to examine the possibility that there might be some kind of connection between a character's rank or status in the novel, and the likelihood of their being given explicit or implicit subject reference in the text.

In order to examine this theory the following procedure was followed. First, a corpus of text was selected: for simplicity's sake this was the same as was used for the survey of honorific verbs above. Second, the identifiable characters in the text were established, that is those characters to whom names could be assigned. Unidentified servants and other characters who only appeared once were ignored, with one exception, when reference could be assigned to yo no Fito and the like, it was assumed that the author was consistent in her reference here and so they were included in survey. The number of explicit and implicit subject references for each character was then noted. The results are displayed below in table form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Explicit Reference</th>
<th>Implicit Reference</th>
<th>Total Number of Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsubo</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaijin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokiden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murasaki</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyōbukyō</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōnagon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myōbu</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzakuin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naishi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The raw data, however, might introduce distortions into any results which might be achieved due to the fact that different characters make different numbers of
appearances in the text. In order to counteract this, the raw data can be expressed as a percentage as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Percentage of Implicit Subjects</th>
<th>Percentage of Explicit Subjects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsubo</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaijin</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokiden</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murasaki</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoi</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyobukyo</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shonagon</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myobu</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzakuin</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naishi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next task was to assign a ‘rank’ to each character. After some consideration it was decided not to use absolute court rank, but to assign each character a numerical value based upon their likely ‘status’ in court society. This value could then be compared with the ranking of their implicit subject percentages as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Status Rank</th>
<th>Implicit Subject Percentage Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzakuin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaijin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyobukyo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsubo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokiden</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murasaki</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myobu</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shonagon</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naishi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Emperor is ranked first in status terms as he is the Suzakuin’s father, the Sadaijin next because of his age and the fact that he would have wielded considerable power in the imperial government. Hyobukyo comes above Genji because he is still a prince
and not a commoner, Fujitsubo above Kokiden because she is the daughter of an Emperor and so on.

Given the above data, it was then necessary to apply a test to see if there was any significant correlation between the two ranks. The test chosen was the calculation of Spearman’s coefficient of correlation or $r$, which can then be used in a $t$-test of significance.¹ For the data above $r=0.831$, and $t=4.95$, indicating that there is a significant relationship between the two ranks. In other words, the higher a character’s rank in the novel, the more likely they are to be referred to with an implicit subject.

A further theory was that there might be a relationship between the number of a character’s appearances and the likelihood of their being referred to with an implicit subject. Consequently, it was tested in a similar fashion, resulting in the following table of rankings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Rank in terms of Number of Appearances</th>
<th>Implicit Subject Percentage Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujitsubo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emperor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munasaki</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myōbu</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadaijin</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kokiden</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyobukyo</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shōnagon</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suzakuin</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naishi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these data we find that $r=0.992$ and $t=26.06$ and thus there is a significant relationship between the number of times a character appears and the likelihood of implicit subject reference being used by the author.

¹ The formulae for the calculation of $p$ and $r$ can be found in Chambers, E.G. (1955) *Statistical Calculation for Beginners* Cambridge University Press, Chapters 5 and 7 respectively.
2.5.1 Similar-Ranked Characters and Reference

As we have seen earlier, where a scene involves characters of varying ranks, it was usual to allow them to be identified most of the time by the use of honorifics. The question arises, however, of what methods were used for character identification when characters of broadly similar ranks are involved. Was it left to context, or were more explicit means used? As an approach to this problem it is proposed to analyse a single *Genji* paragraph, which deals with four characters of roughly the same rank, in order to see what means the author uses to ensure that they are satisfactorily identified. The paragraph chosen comes from *Momiji no Ga* and deals with Genji, Murasaki, her Grandmother and her Grand Uncle (the Nun and the Priest).

幼き人は、見つけるふりに、いとよさ心響、かたちにして、何
心もなく惚れまはし猿聞き給ぶ。時し殿内の内の人にも誰と知ら
せじと思って、なお離れた対に、御しほらひ二もなくして、我
も入りおはして、よろづの御事子どを教へ給ぶ。手木習せな
どしつつ、ただ外なりげる御女を迎へ給へらんようてぞ思した
る。政所、家司など始め、殊に分ちて、心もとならず仕う
まつらせ給ふ。惟光より外の人は、おぼつかなくのみ思い聞え
たり。かの父宮もえ知り聞え給はぎりけり。桜君は、なら時々
思い品で聞え給ふ時は、尼君を廻り聞いて給ふ折多かり。君のお
はする程は、往らはし給ふを、夜などは、時々こそとまり給へ、
こいかさの御帳なくて、暮るれば出で給ふを、暮り聞き給ふ
折などあるを、いとらうなた思い聞え給へり。二十三日にさば
らひ、大殿にもおはるる折は、いといただく途しなど給へは、
心苦しくて、母き子持たらん心地して、ありきも静心なく覚
え給ぶ。僧都はかくなと聞き給ふて、怪しきものから、うれ
しとなんぼしける。かの御法事などし給ふにも、いかめしほ
訪らり聞え給へり。1

wosanaki Fito Fa mituitamaFu mama ni ito yoki kokorozama katari nite
nani kokoro no naku muture matoFasikikoetamaFu sibasi tomo no uti
no Fito ni mo tare to sinase to obosite naFo Fanaretaru tai ni
oFonsitufaFini ninakusite ware mo akekure iroFasite yorobado no
oFonkotoFodo wo wos FiorikikoetamaFu teFon kakite naraFase nado
situtu tada Fokanarikeru oFonmusume wo mukaFetamaFeran yau ni zo
obositatu mandokoro keisi nado wo Fazime koto ni wakatite
kokoromotonakarazu tukaumaturasetamaFu koremitu yori Foka no Fito
Fa obontuukanaka nomi omoFikikoetari kano titimiyia mo
esirikikoetamaFazarikeri Fimegimi Fa naFo tokiFoki
omoFidekikoetamaFu toki Fa amagimi wo koFikikoetamaFu wori
oFokari kimi no oFasuru Fodo Fa maginaFasitamaFu wo yoru nado Fa
tokidoki koso tomaritamaFe kokokasiko no oFonotama nakute kurureba
idetamaFu wo sitaFikikoetamaFu wori nado aru wo to rautaku
omoFikikoetamaFeri Futu mikka uti ni saburiFi oFotono ni mo oFasuru
wori Fa ito itaku kusi nado sitamaFeba kokorogurutute FaFanaki ko

---

1 Inaizumi et al (1976) p1-48
The child, being good-natured and attractive, had naturally become used to and drawn to him since he had discovered her. Thinking that for a little while he would not let the people of the household know who she was, he had had one of the more distant halls decorated second to none and himself spent days and nights there, teaching her many things. As he had her write and learn calligraphy, he thought it was just as if he had brought in a daughter from elsewhere. He had established a steward's office for her and made sure she lacked for nothing. With the exception of Koremitsu, everyone was most unsure. Even her father knew nothing about it, it seems. The princess, particularly when she was remembering, often thought fondly of the Nun. While the prince was there, she was distracted, but at night, although he sometimes stayed, he had no leisure from his affairs here and there and when night fell he would leave and when at times she trailed after him, he thought her quite sweet. The times when he served two or three days at court, and also at his wife's house, he felt dreadfully oppressive and painful, feeling as if he had a motherless child, even his affairs were no consolation. The Priest hearing that it was so, apparently thought it surprising, but felt pleased. Genji contributed lavishly for the memorial service.

---

1The original here refers to two different types of "office" which would have had jurisdiction over different aspects of Murasaki's affairs. As the differences are not particularly important, both have been subsumed into "steward's office".

to this one have all been concerned with Genji, he can be assumed to be the subject here, an interpretation that also fits a reader’s knowledge of the plot. Consequently, both Genji and Murasaki are established as being under discussion in this paragraph, even though only one of them has been mentioned explicitly.

After this brief digression to the past, the rest of the sentence can be taken as having Murasaki as the subject. This makes sense both from the meanings of the words, as well as the final combination of OH and SH auxiliaries.

The next sentence starts, almost immediately, with a reference to *tono no uti* as part of someone’s quoted thought. The question is, who is doing the thinking and informing? The meanings of the verbs make it plain that it must be Genji. As a child Murasaki would be in no position to decide about informing people of anything and, consequently, it must also be Genji doing the thinking. Such an interpretation is reinforced by the use of the relatively high SH verb *obosu* for “think”. Thus the subject has changed, from Murasaki in the previous sentence, to Genji in this one, without any explicit marking.

Now that Genji has been established as the subject of the sentence, the subsequent description of the decorating of Murasaki’s quarters can also be attributed to him. Why then, is it necessary to follow this with a further reference to him, *ware mo*? Might it not be to make it absolutely clear that the verb phrase *irioFasite* actually refers to Genji, and not Murasaki? Without it an interpretation along the lines of:

...he had a distant hall decorated second to none and she entered it...
would not only be entirely possible, but likely. As there is no way to indicate the subject with honorifics, due to the characters' similarity in rank, and the context is unclear, an explicit reference has been made. The remainder of the sentence can then be taken as having Genji as its subject. The following two sentences too, as there are no indications to the contrary, have Genji as their subject. Note that both have honorific auxiliaries attached only to the sentence final verbs, so it would seem that honorifics occupied a similar position in LOJ to tense-markers in MJ, in that it is the sentence final marking that was important.

Here we have three sentences, each with a different subject, and all clearly marked. The first has Koremitu yori Foka no Fito marked with Fa in its role of differentiating between two themes. This is clearly necessary because even though the sentence final honorifics make it clear that the subject is someone of a lower rank, context cannot supply an identity for the subject. The second sentence has kano titimiya, marked with the emphatic particle mo. Again this is necessary as, though the honorifics indicate a change of subject to a higher-ranked person, neither Genji nor Murasaki, the two high-ranked people under discussion, would make sense in the context. The third sentence returns to the original theme with Fimegimi Fa. Without this explicit marking, Murasaki's father, Hyōbukyō would be interpreted as the subject, giving:

Even her father knew nothing about it, it seems. When he remembered her, he often thought fondly of the Nun.
It seems that the author is doing everything necessary in order to prevent confusion, which is hardly the mark of extreme vagueness.

This sentence starts with the re-introduction of Genji, with *kimi no oFasuru Fodo*, marked with *Fa*. Similarly to the first sentence of this paragraph, though, the presence of *Fodo* marks this clause as an adverbial element and thus Genji does not become the subject of the following verb, *magiraFasitamaFu*, an interpretation which is reinforced by the meaning of *magiraFasu*, “be distracted/consoled”. There is some evidence to suggest that the presence of the particle *wo* in post-verbal position, as it is here, could act as a “signpost” to indicate a possible change of subject to a LOJ reader, and looking at the subsequent clauses of this sentence, it would seem to be correct. After the first *wo*, the subject changes to Genji, after the second it goes back to Murasaki and after the third it returns to Genji again. Of course, there are other indications. In the first clause, *tomaru*, “stay” is modified with *tamaFu*, which in this case is an OH auxiliary, and not a SH one, thus giving the sense that the subject stays with someone of high rank. If Murasaki were the subject, this would mean:

...at night, although she sometimes stayed with him...

which makes no sense as it was she who remained in one place and Genji who came to visit. If, instead of the OH, there was the SH, *tomaritamaFi*, it would mean only

---

1 Note that oFasu is used three times in this paragraph, each time to refer to Genji. As with Fujitsubo earlier, it does seem to be being used to pick him out and thus make identifying him easier.

2 See Chapter 3 for a detailed discussion on this point.
that someone of high rank stayed somewhere. The subject would still only be
interpretable as Genji, but it would be less clear than the text as it stands. Similarly, if
one observes the remaining verbs in the sentence, the use of honorifics adds extra
meaning to make comprehension clearer. With Genji already established as the
subject, the clause final verb idu, “go out/leave”, is modified only with the SH
auxiliary tamaFu as Genji’s departure has no connection with Murasaki. In the
subsequent clauses, however, sitaFu and omoFu are modified with both SH and OH
auxiliaries as it is Genji that Murasaki is trailing after and Murasaki that he is thinking
of. As Genji is the subject of the final clause of this sentence, he can be assumed to
be the subject of the following one, and indeed this interpretation makes sense.

We now reach the final two sentences of the paragraph. The first has a clearly
marked change of theme with soudu, “priest”, marked with Fa, and he is the person
who hears and thinks. This is relatively straightforward. It would also be him who
would be performing the memorial services for the Nun, who was, after all, his sister.
The final clause, however, is more problematic. The Priest would not be sending
offerings for the ceremony, which is what toburaFu means, so the subject must
change here. The only possible subject is Genji, as the only other person mentioned
recently, Murasaki, is a child and dependent upon Genji in any case. Here, it is only
the context which permits a reader to identify Genji as the subject though, as there are
no other indications.

If we consider the above analysis it seems that one can come to the conclusion
that the author’s style does not seem to be particularly vague, on the contrary, she
seems to be going out of her way, in LOJ terms, to make it clear, where there is the possibility of confusion, who is doing what at each point in her narrative. In one extremely short paragraph, there are no fewer than seven explicit references to the characters concerned, might this not be because the majority of them are of similar rank and so honorifics alone cannot perform the task?

2.6 Conclusion

Following our study of honorifics we have found that they are a major factor in eliminating vagueness from the Genji text. If we consider the linguistic attitudes to vagueness mentioned earlier, then it seems that there is little evidence for describing LOJ as vague at the structural level. The fact that honorific verbs, both SH and OH, by their nature indicate the presence of a grammatical subject or object in deep sentence structure, even where that person is not explicitly mentioned on the surface, means that to a large extent characters in the text are identified on the syntactic level. Particularly useful in this regard is the fact that it is possible to combine SH and OH verbs in LOJ, thus clearly indicating the presence of both subject and object. Of course, any attempt to model this would have to be extremely complex, and the difficulties inherent in the process have been clearly indicated elsewhere. Obviously it is necessary as a reader to make a pragmatic assumption that Murasaki intends her text to be understood, and is not being deliberately obscure, but by bearing this in mind, characters are not difficult to identify. Further evidence for this contention comes from the fact that, as described in section 2.6.1, when characters of similar ranks are being described, more explicit information is given to aid in their identification.

\[^1\] See section 1.5
\[^2\] See Harada (1975)
Endnotes

1. The intention in the analysis of the text has been to provide a one word gloss for all elements of the text wherever possible. In order to show syntactic elements not amenable to this method, the following symbols have been used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>Tense, Mood or Aspect marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P(EMPH)</td>
<td>Emphatic Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Object Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>Object Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>Quotative Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negative Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUSE</td>
<td>Causative Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Subject Honorific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>Subject Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THE</td>
<td>Theme Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>Question Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Honorific verb forms which are completely honorific, rather than being non-honorific forms with auxiliaries added, are indicated as follows: (say-SH) or say(SH).
Chapter Three

Switch Reference

3.0 Introduction

The function of switch-reference (SR) in language has been described as that of a processing aid which:

\[ \ldots \text{instruct[s] the listener in the anticipation of how next to manipulate the discourse representation.}^{1} \]

This would make it seem like a pragmatic device for the elimination of ambiguity or vagueness. It seems, however, to be more than just "an optional device to ward off ambiguity" as it appears in contexts where it is redundant\(^2\) and, in fact, a pragmatic role for SR has specifically been denied in one of the major theoretical works on the subject,\(^3\) although this view has been the subject of some criticism as we shall see later. As a basic definition, in SR certain syntactic particles or verbal inflections serve the purpose of indicating that the subject of the verb of a subsequent clause is either the same as that of the previous one or that it is different, thus obviating the need for explicit subject marking. Obviously, if such a system could be proved to exist in LOJ, it would have implications for the subject of our study, as SR particles would serve to reduce the level of vagueness in the text.

In this chapter we will examine the concept of SR and its applicability to LOJ in general and the *Genji Monogatari* in particular. We will begin with an examination of the concept of SR and a brief survey of the existing literature, concentrating on the areas which are of most relevance for our purposes. We will then move on to consider previous work which has dealt with SR and Old Japanese. Finally, we will analyse a corpus of text in an attempt to discover how relevant SR may be in eradicating vagueness from a text in LOJ.

\(^{2}\) Finer (1985) p45
\(^{3}\) Finer (1985) p49
3.1 Switch Reference

SR was first identified as a phenomenon in Native American languages in 1967, and since then SR systems have been identified in languages ranging from non-Austronesian and Australian ones to some African ones.¹ There is, consequently, an extensive literature on the topic which breaks down into three general categories: first, accounts of the SR systems of particular languages; second, speculations concerning the origins or exact nature of SR phenomena;² and third, attempts to provide formal accounts for SR systems within the purview of one or other linguistic theory.³

The research has led to the development of what may be called a canonical definition of SR which, at its most basic, is the following:

\[ \text{SR is a verbal affixation system which indicates whether or not the subject of the marked verb is co-referential with the subject of some other verb.}^{4} \]

This can be seen in the following examples:\⁵

(1) a. nya-isvar-k iima-k
    when-sing-SS dance-Tns
    “When he sang, he danced.”

b. nya-isvar-m iima-k
    when-sing-DS dance-Tns
    “When he sang, he danced.”

(2) a. ye nan su-ab isomci
    I tree cut-SS I_went_down
    “I cut the tree and went down.”

b. ye nan su-inxe isorei
    I tree cut-DS it_went_down
    “I cut the tree down.”

¹ Stirling, Lesley (1993) *Switch Reference and Discourse Representation* Cambridge University Press, p5. The term non-Austronesian here would seem to refer to a specific language family.
² For example Akiba (1977), Haiman (1983) and Givon (1983)
³ For example Finer (1985), Tsujimura (1987) and Stirling (1993)
⁵ Both examples are from Stirling (1993) p3. (1) is from Mojave, a North American language and (2) is from Usan, a Papuan language. The glosses given follow Stirling’s system.
The canonical definition, however, goes beyond the above to include a number of conditions which have been used to identify whether or not a particular language has an SR system:

(a) The Locality Condition: SR holds between just two linearly adjacent clauses.
(b) The Dependency Condition: the SR marked clause is dependent, syntactically or semantically on the controlling clause.
(c) The Realisation Condition: SR is marked by a suffix on the verb of the dependent clause.
(d) The Subject Condition: the SR pivot is the surface subject of the marked and controlling clauses.
(e) The Functional Condition: SR functions to signal obligatory co-disjoint reference between the pivot NPs.

Examples (1) and (2) above fit the canonical definition of SR and comply with all of the conditions (a)-(e).

Nevertheless, SR has been considered sufficiently unusual for a researcher to say of it that it is “relatively rare, and it is weird.” (Original author’s italics.) This is ascribed to the fact that SR:

...appears to violate very general iconic tendencies whereby categories which define properties of nouns are expressed by nominal affixes, while conversely, categories which define properties of verbs are expressed by affixes on the verb.2

In the light of more recent work, however, the above statement seems somewhat excessive. It has been suggested that SR marking appears on the verb as a result of general typological characteristics of the languages in which it appears,4 which would mean that SR is by no means as unusual a phenomenon as it has been made out to be. Moreover, it also seems that the canonical definition of SR is too narrow, as it is possible to find examples from numerous languages of apparent violations of SR marking. This means the use of Same Subject (SS) when one would expect Different Subject (DS) and vice versa.

---

1 The following list is taken from Stirling (1993) p6-7, as is the term "Switch Reference pivot".
2 Haiman, John (1983) p105
3 Haiman, John (1983) p105
4 Stirling (1993) Ibid, pp11-12
This is not the place, however, for an exhaustive survey and discussion of the literature, as that has been done elsewhere.\textsuperscript{1} We should note at this point, however, several of the key features which have been used to expand the domain of SR and which may be useful in our later discussion of SR and LOJ.

First, SR systems are functionally complex, with the elements which serve to indicate SS or DS often fulfilling a range of other functions in addition to their SR ones. The most common additional meaning is temporal, although information concerning person number and gender also occur\textsuperscript{2} and, furthermore, SR systems often:

\ldots also incorporate distinctions in the logical or epistemic relations between the two clauses... meaning distinctions normally translated into English expressions such as: if, because, so that, but, although, in spite of, nevertheless, in order to, presumably, resulting in, providing, etc.\textsuperscript{3}

Second, the terms SS and DS may, in fact, be inaccurate as there is evidence to suggest that SR may apply to other elements besides the syntactic subject, such as topic, for example.\textsuperscript{4} This brings in two further points: if SR can apply to elements other than the syntactic subject, it is possible that it may have a wider range of influence than just between individual clauses and, consequently, rather than being strictly a “verbal affixation system”,\textsuperscript{5} it may be more appropriate to view it as relating to the clause as a whole,\textsuperscript{6} and even operating across sentence boundaries. All of these various points are in conflict with the canonical definition of SR, as represented by Finer (1985), who states that SR is sentence bound, local and limited to subjects.\textsuperscript{7}

As mentioned previously, the canonical definition of SR has been shown to be deficient, in that it is possible to find examples of “violations” of SR marking from numerous languages. Recent work, therefore:

\textsuperscript{1} Stirling (1993)
\textsuperscript{2} Stirling (1993) p39
\textsuperscript{3} Stirling (1993) p42
\textsuperscript{4} See Stirling (1993) Section 1.3.4 for a detailed discussion of this point.
\textsuperscript{5} Haiman (1985) p105
\textsuperscript{6} Stirling (1993) p12
\textsuperscript{7} Finer (1985) p8
...claims that switch-reference should be seen as a complex relation of agreement/disagreement between clauses which indicates their degree of discourse continuity/discontinuity.¹

Within this definition, apparent violations of SR marking can be seen as being the result of the fact that DS and SS markers have a wider range of functions than simply indicating co/disjoint subject reference, with the result that both types of violation, that is unexpected DS and SS marking, can be shown to be relatively systematic across a variety of languages, with unexpected SS marking involving impersonal constructions;² and unexpected DS marking being:

...functional extensions of DS marking to indicate a range of semantic discontinuities between clauses in the switch-reference relation.³

For example, DS marking can be used with co-referential subjects in Eastern Porno (a Native American (Hokan) language) if there is a change in agentivity between the clauses concerned;⁴ in Lenakel (an Austronesian language) it can mark a change in temporal interval;⁵ and in Amele (a Papuan language) it can mark changes in spatial and temporal location, or modality.⁶ Consequently, often:

...DS is ambiguous, and fails to signal unequivocally whether the subjects of the two clauses are coreferential or not.⁷

The expansion of the domain of SR, from an obligatory, local system, solely concerned with subject reference, to a system concerned with a wider range of semantic phenomena, will obviously have implications for our study of LOJ. A canonical SR system would be a major tool for the disambiguation of LOJ text, whereas the wider system proposed by Stirling (1993) would be of more limited value. Let us, therefore, consider the extant work on SR and LOJ and attempt to discover to what extent the LOJ SR system is canonical, and how far any violations fit in with the functional extensions mentioned earlier.

¹ Stirling (1993) p59
⁵ Stirling (1993) pp100–113
⁷ Stirling (1993) pl10
3.2 Switch Reference in Late Old Japanese

The suggestion that SR was a relevant concept in LOJ syntax was first made by Akiba. She identifies the clause-ending particles -te, -ba, -ni and -wo as having a SR function. This interpretation was at variance with traditional Japanese interpretations which are as follows:

1. Traditional Japanese interpretations of SR particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particle</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>expresses sequentiaity of events</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| -tutu    | 1. expresses a paratactic relationship, “while...”  
2. expresses continuation of an event or state; “X is ...ing...” |
| -ba      | 1. expresses conditional meaning; “if...”    
2. expresses cause-effect relationship; “since...”  
3. expresses condition and result relationship; “when... then...” |
| -ni      | in “X ni Y”, X gives background information for Y; “X and therefore Y”, “X but Y”, “X and then Y”, and so on |
| -wo      | wo carries similar meanings to ni            |
| -do      | “X do Y” emphasizes on adversative cause-result relationship such as “although...” and “despite...” |

Note that these meanings all fit well within the functional extensions of SR particles mentioned above. Nevertheless, Akiba claims that these particles are:

...better characterizable in terms of the switch reference function. That is, conjunctive te signals retention of the subject and ba, wo, or ni a switch of the subject.

Indeed, Akiba seems to reject the traditional Japanese interpretation of some of these particles’ meanings completely, in favour of an SR analysis, although she does allow -ni and -wo to be:

...conjunctive particles with a secondary function of signalling switch reference...

In other words, she does not allow for the functional extension of the LOJ SR system, and is arguing for the canonical account.

---

1 In her article Akiba refers to the language under consideration as “Old Japanese”. All the works she considers, however, date from the LOJ period and so we will continue to use this term.
3 Taken from Fujii Noriko (1991) Discourse Perspectives on Grammar 3: Historical Discourse Analysis Grammatical Subject in Japanese Mouton de Gruyter, p135
4 Akiba (1977) p611
5 Akiba (1977) p616
In order to provide evidence for her theory, Akiba carried out a survey of three LOJ texts: *Taketori Monogatari* (竹取物語), *Genji Monogatari* and *Tsutsumi Chunagon Monogatari* (堤中納言物語). As Akiba acknowledges, there is a historical gap between the first of these works and the second two, with *Taketori Monogatari* being written circa 920, *Genji Monogatari* circa 1000 and *Tsutsumi Chunagon Monogatari* circa 1055. This places *Genji* and *Tsutsumi* together as Late Heian works, but makes *Taketori* a Middle Heian one.

Akiba produces the following information from her survey:

2. **Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in *Genji* from Akiba (1977)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Retention of subject</th>
<th>Switch of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wo</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in *Taketori* from Akiba (1977)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Retention of subject</th>
<th>Switch of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

She provides no numerical data for *Tsutsumi Chunagon Monogatari*. Akiba does not test these data statistically to check their significance, but if this is done, then the results for *Genji* produce a value of $\chi^2=94.96$, indicating that the difference is significant. Similarly, for *Taketori* the data produce a value of $\chi^2=84.88$, again indicating a significant difference in the distribution of the particles.

---

1 Akiba's survey of the *Genji* was limited to three chapters, although she does not say which ones. See Akiba (1977) p610
2 Akiba (1977) p610
3 There is some disagreement over the exact date for this work. See Miller Ead, Otagiri Hiroko, Morrell, Robert E. (1985) *The Princeton Companion to Classical Japanese Literature* Princeton University Press, p245
4 Akiba (1977) pp613–614
5 Akiba (1977) pp612–613
Based on the data above, Akiba claims the existence of SR in LOJ, and explains counter examples to the function of -te by the fact that they occur only “in clauses the subject of which is not easily identifiable”.\(^1\) For example, “expressions of time, distance and weather [that] either are devoid of surface subjects or have subjects which will never be definite.”\(^2\) Counter examples to the role of -ba are said to occur only in “a copula sentence and/or a sentence with a perfective or past tense auxiliary,”\(^3\) and that counter examples for ni and wo are infrequent enough to “confirm the view that wo and ni are different subject markers.”\(^4\)

Recently, however, Akiba’s findings have been criticised by Fujii, who feels that:

> ...the function of retention or switch of subject referent is not a matter of 100%, and is weaker than is claimed by Akiba(1977)... Ba shows a strong tendency to switch the subject, and wo, ni, do, a slightly weaker tendency to switch the subject. Te, tsutsu, and zero\(^5\) indicate a tendency to retain the subject.\(^6\)

With regard to “zero conjunction”,\(^7\) that is linkage of two clauses with a predicate CF without an affix, she also notes that “if the second clause has an implicit subject, as a general principle, there is no switch [and] if it is different, it is explicitly mentioned.”\(^8\) There are, however, two environments in which this may not be the case and the second clause may have an implicit, but different, subject. The first is if the “higher thematic reference of the two clauses is the same, even though the two clauses have a different subject, or the subjects of the two clauses are related.”\(^9\) The second environment, which also applies to clauses connected with an affix, is if “the subject of the second clause is usually implicit no matter where it appears in the discourse,
particularly in expressions of time, weather, situation and general perspective."¹ This would seem to correspond with the findings of Akiba mentioned above.

As evidence to support her conclusions, Fujii provides the following data from a survey of *Kiritsubo*, the first chapter of the *Genji*.

### 4. Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in *Kiritsubo* from Fujii(1991)²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Retention of subject</th>
<th>Switch of subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-φ</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tsutsu</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Obviously, these data do appear to support the conclusions she draws above. The fact that she does not subject them to any kind of test, however, means that one cannot be certain that the variations she observes are not the result of chance. The small size of Fujii’s sample also militates against the results being meaningful, although they may be suggestive. If these data are tested, however, then they produce a value of $\chi^2=65.47$, indicating a significant difference in the distribution of the particles examined.

Unlike Akiba, however, Fujii does allow that SR particles may have other meanings beyond those of signalling of co/disjoint subject reference, in fact:

> ...it is not unusual that the switch-reference markers in Old Japanese have other meanings (or the original meaning?) and that the switch-reference function shows conflict.³

Nevertheless, her analysis of SR is still very much based upon the canonical account and she does not consider the possibility of SR having a wider functional domain than that of indicating subject switch.

---

¹ Fujii (1991) p139
² Fujii (1991) p137
³ Fujii (1991) p141
3.3 Switch Reference in *Sakaki*

In order to examine the issue of SR in LOJ further, it was decided to conduct a survey of another, longer, *Genji* chapter in the expectation that this would generate more material for analysis. To this end the chapter *Sakaki* was chosen and analysed, producing the following results:

5. Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in *Sakaki*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Retention of Subject</th>
<th>Switch of Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-φ</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tutu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of these results with those achieved by Fujii shows that even with a larger sample the per centages for retention and switch of subject remain remarkably similar for the various affixes. It is possible, however, to subdivide each of the two categories further: into those cases where subject is retained/switched implicitly/explicitly. This gives the following results:

---

1. The Imazumi et al (1976) text was used for analysis. Clauses analysed were limited to narrative, omitting directly quoted speech and poetry.
6. Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in *Sakaki*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>No. of Occs.</th>
<th>Retention of Subject</th>
<th>Switch of Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implicit</td>
<td>Explicit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>φ</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tutu</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wo</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For these data, $\chi^2=253.4$, indicating a significant difference in the distribution of the particles. In spite of this, however, the above table shows that even for the affixes indicating a switch of subject, that is -ni, -wo, -ba and -do, a new subject is explicitly introduced in approximately 50% of the cases for -ni and -wo, and approximately 40% of cases for -ba and -do. This would seem to suggest that the specific subject switch function of these affixes is relatively weak although, as has been mentioned before, it has been suggested that SR marking does appear in environments where it is redundant.\(^1\) It would seem, however, that if a SR system was sufficiently strong and well-developed to require the presence of SR markers even when redundant, that there would not be large numbers of apparent violations of SR marker usage. This is obviously not the case in LOJ.

If we then take the viewpoint that we can only consider as potential examples of SR cases where there is not an explicit subject mentioned in the second clause, our sample provides the following results:

\(^1\) Finer (1985) p.15
7. Switch-reference of conjunctive particles in Sakaki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Number of Occurrences</th>
<th>Retention of Subject</th>
<th>Switch of Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-φ</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>89.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tutu</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ni</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-wo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data would seem to suggest that while it may be possible to regard -φ, -te and -tutu as same subject markers, the case for regarding the others as different subject markers is relatively weak, except possibly in the case of -ba, although even here in more than a third of cases there is retention of subject rather than a shift.

Let us at this point briefly recapitulate the environments in which Akiba and Fujii claim violations of SR marking are possible and normal:

8. Environments for aberrant SR marking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particles</th>
<th>Akiba</th>
<th>Fujii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akiba</td>
<td>Fujii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>1. Expressions with not easily identified subjects: e.g. time, weather, distance</td>
<td>Expressions where higher thematic reference is the same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Expressions concerning inalienable possession, i.e. body parts, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Idiomatic expressions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-φ</td>
<td>Expressions where higher thematic reference is the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>1. Clauses containing a copula</td>
<td>Expressions where the subject is always implicit, e.g. time, weather, situation, general perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Clauses containing a perfective or past tense auxiliary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All affixes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it can be seen that there is, in fact, a degree of agreement between Akiba and Fujii. Both refer to expressions of time and weather, although Akiba limits the applicability of SR violations to -te and Fujii permits it with all of the SR affixes she studies. Similarly, Akiba's "inalienable possession" corresponds
closely to Fujii’s “higher thematic reference”, as can be seen from the examples they use to demonstrate their points:

(3)  on- me  Fa  sirome  ni -te  Fusi -tamaFe -ri
SH-  eyes  THE  white eye  be  -T lie down  -SH  -T

...his eyes are white and he is lying down.2

(4)  yose  omoku  utaga Finaku  mauke no kimi  to  yo  ni
expectations  heavy  doubtful  crown prince  Q  world  P
motekasiduki  -kikoyure  -do
value  -OH  -although

...{people’s} expectations were high and, although they valued him as someone who would doubtless become Crown Prince...3

Even though Akiba’s example is more concrete than that of Fujii, they would seem to be similar types of constructions.

At this point let us examine how well the various environments allowing violations of SR marking in LOJ allowed for by Akiba and Fujii correspond with the more general functional extensions of SR marking identified by Stirling. Stirling’s environments are as follows:

9. Environments for Unexpected SR marking from Stirling (1993)4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unexpected SS marking</th>
<th>Unexpected DS marking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal expressions, especially if there is no change of “agentive” subject or participant.</td>
<td>Semantic discontinuity between clauses, including changes in agentivity, temporal interval, spatial and temporal location and modality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By “agentive participant” is meant “a participant who is presented by the speaker as possessing [volitional] control – at least to some extent”5 over an eventuality. From the listing of Akiba and Fujii’s environments for SR violations given above, it would

---

1 In both of the following examples the syntax has been analyzed according to the conventions we have been following in this thesis and not as by the original author.
2 Akiba (1977) p613
3 Fujii (1993) pl39
4 Stirling (1993) Chapter 2
5 Stirling (1993) p61
seem that they agree with Stirling's analysis to a great extent, particularly where cases of violations of SS marking are concerned. In fact, Stirling even uses Akiba to support her own analysis.1 There are, however, numerous examples in Sakaki where SR marking is apparently aberrant, and is not accounted for by either Akiba or Fujii's analysis.

Let us examine some of these cases of apparent violations of SR conditions affix by affix, in order to discover whether or not there are other environments in which violations regularly occur, or if the violations turn out not to be violations if considered in the light of Stirling's account. First, let us examine cases involving -ni, although some other affixes will be considered where they occur in close proximity to -ni.2

(5) 月日を隔て絵へらんほどを思いやるに、いといみじうあ
はれに心苦し3

Here we have two clauses separated by the DS marker -ni, and yet there is no change of subject. Genji is the person imagining how Rokujō must have spent her time at her daughter's shrine, and he is also the one finding these thoughts moving and painful. The main verb of the first clause, however, is not modified with any type of tense or aspect auxiliary, occurring simply in its AF, obosiyaru. The only way in which it seems possible to account for this example, and still define -ni as a DS marker in this context, is to say that, in fact, the subject of the second clause is not Genji, but his thoughts and so -ni is marking a separation between the person performing the action

---

1 Stirling (1993) pp93-94
2 Clause boundaries will be indicated in this analysis by a double vertical line.
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p206
of thinking and the quality and nature of the thoughts themselves. This, however, does seem to be somewhat tenuous, as his thoughts would seem to be very closely associated with Genji himself.

If, however, we accept that the agentive subject of both clauses is the same, and consider -ni to be instead marking a degree of discontinuity between the clauses, in that the second clause expresses the result or effect of the act of thinking expressed by the first clause, the analysis makes sense.

(6) とすに、いと怖ろしきれば、御祈をさへさせさせ給ひて

Clause (a) of the above excerpt, of which only the end is given, is a long piece of quoted thought in which Fujitsubo agonises over the dangers, both to her and her son, posed by Genji’s attentions. The situation here is similar to that given above, in that whether or not this is a violation of SR marking depends upon what is considered to be the subject of clause (b). If it is Fujitsubo and she is frightened, then -ni cannot be marking a switch of subject. If, however, the subject is taken to be something less tangible, such as an implicit “situation” or even “it”, giving a translation:

...when she thought...as she was very frightened, she had prayers said and...

then is may be possible to accept a switch of subject here. Fujitsubo remains the theme of clause (b), however, and returns as the subject of clause (c), so the degree of switching that is occurring in this context is difficult to quantify. It may, therefore, be more productive to see the SR markers not as indicating a switch of subject, but instead the fact that the second clause describes the result of the action described in

\[\text{Imaiizumi et al (1976) p216}\]
the first, and the third clause the actions Fujitsubo takes as a result of the feelings described by clause (b).

(7) 出であんが今さらにつましきこと、ともすに、いとも
томへすは 情なうもてなさんにもたけからねば

This case is similar to that immediately above, although here we have three clauses and two DS markers, -ni and -do, instead of one. Rokujō is the person thinking about receiving Genji and she is also clearly the person who is not strong enough to treat him unfeelingly. The problem arises about the subject of the adjective monousi, here in its PF monoukere-. If it is Rokujō herself, then it is difficult to analyse either -ni or -do as DS markers. If, on the other hand, the subject is taken as being her thoughts, then it may be possible. As in the above case this seems a tenuous analysis, as the difference between taking ito monoukeredo to mean “Rokujō suffered” and “Rokujō’s thoughts were painful [for her]” does not seem that great. Alternatively, one could say that neither marker is actually indicating a switch of subject, but semantic discontinuity between the clauses. As above, the clause (b) is the result/effect of the action in clause (a), and clause (c) is qualitatively different as it describes an action Rokujo could not take rather than one she does, or something she experiences.

(8) 古き宮は、却て旅心地し給ふにも、御里住絶えたる年
月の程、思しきむらさきのペシ。
This excerpt is describing Fujitsubo’s feelings on her return to her own palace after the death of the Kiritsubo Emperor, Genji’s father. The two clauses are separated by the particle *ni*, and yet Fujitsubo is clearly the subject of both clauses, as is evidenced by the fact that the main verb of the first clause, *kokotisu*, “feel”, is modified by the SH auxiliary *-tamaFu*, and the main verb of the second clause, *obosimegurasu*, “think something over” is also SH by virtue of the inclusion of the *obosi*-element.

Obviously, therefore, *ni* cannot be functioning as a DS marker in this context. It might be possible to argue, however, that its SR function has been overridden by the fact that the higher thematic referent of both clauses, Fujitsubo, is the same. This would require an extension of the environments in which this is possible from the presence of *-te* and *-φ* allowed by Fujii and Akiba. Another interpretation would be that there is, in fact, a difference between the clauses, although not of subject, and this is what *-ni* is marking here. The first clause is a straightforward description of Fujitsubo’s feelings, but the second does not assert that it is the truth as strongly due to the presence of the auxiliary *-besi* at its end.

\[ (9) \]

\[ \text{Imaizumi et al (1976) p216} \]
After the Kiritsubo emperor’s death, Genji has continued to pursue Fujitsubo, in spite of all of her efforts to persuade him to desist. This causes her great anxiety and distress as she fears that any rumours of a relationship between them could threaten the position of her son, the Crown Prince. Unfortunately for Fujitsubo, Genji is her major supporter, and so she cannot risk alienating him, as this would also threaten her son’s position.

Fujitsubo is identified as the subject of clause (a) by the SH auxiliary -tamaFu, here in its NF, -tamaFa. It concludes with -ba, but the subject of clause (b) is also Fujitsubo, again indicated by the presence of an SH auxiliary. She has no supporters and she relies upon Genji. Clause (b) concludes with the particle ni, indicating a change of subject and, indeed, this turns out to be the case with the subject of clause (c) being Genji’s behaviour. Clause (b), however, also contains the perfective aspect marker -ri in its own AF, -ru. This makes it an environment in which we could expect to find a violation of SR marking and a retention rather than a change of subject. The fact that this does not happen in this case must lead us to conclude that the mere presence of a perfective aspect marker is not sufficient, in and of itself, to trigger a violation of SR conditions.

If we consider the excerpt in the light of Stirling’s analysis, however, we can see that all of the clauses marked with DS markers do display some kind of discontinuity from each other. Clause (b) is discontinuous from clause (a) temporally as Fujitsubo had relied upon Genji. Clause (c) is discontinuous from the second both
temporally and in that it has a different subject, and clause (d) has a different subject from clause (c).

(10) 男は、憂し、つらし、と思ひ聞え給ふ事隣なきに、來し方行く先かき昏す心地して

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>wotoko</th>
<th>Fu</th>
<th>usi</th>
<th>turasi</th>
<th>to</th>
<th>omoFi</th>
<th>-kikoe</th>
<th>-tamaFu</th>
<th>koto</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>man</td>
<td>THE</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>heartless</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>think</td>
<td>-OH</td>
<td>-SH</td>
<td>fact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| kagirinaki | ni | kishikatayukusaki | kakikurasu | kokoti | si |
| limitless   | when/DS | future and past | make dark | feeling | do |

-TE
-T/SS

When the man thought strongly that she was cruel and heartless, he felt that she had made both the future and the past dark and...

Genji has finally managed, by one subterfuge or another, to get in to see Fujitsubo. Naturally, she is shocked and horrified, treats him as coldly as possible, resulting in the thoughts portrayed above. Genji is clearly established as the theme of what is to follow by an explicit reference to him, wotoko Fa, and the first clause concludes with the predicate kagirinasi, "be limitless", here in its AF, kagirinaki, and followed by ni. The subject of kagirinasi is Genji’s feelings concerning Fujitsubo’s cruelty, and he is the subject of the following clause, in that he is the one feeling that the future and the past have been made dark. If SR is being interpreted in a narrow sense, then ni here can be taken as marking a DS as the subject changes from Genji’s feelings to him himself. The extent of the change, though, does not seem that great, particularly as Genji is so clearly established as the theme at the beginning of the excerpt. Rather than emphasising the change of subject element here, might it not be more productive to view ni as emphasising the fact that the feelings Genji is having in the second clause are the result of his thoughts concerning Fujitsubo in the first?

(11) さらに他人と思ひわきがたきを、なほ限なく昔より思ひしめ聞えてし心の思ひなしにや、様殊にいみじうねびまきり給ひにけるかなと、類なくおぼえ給ふに、心惑して

1 Imazumi et al (1976) p216
Genji is watching Fujitsubo from concealment, pondering the similarities between her and Murasaki and coming to the conclusion that Fujitsubo is the more beautiful of the two.

Clause (a) has Genji as its subject as he is the person judging Fujitsubo and Murasaki, and the clause ends with -wo. Clause (b) is an intrusion into the narrative by the narrator, offering a speculation as to why Genji may be feeling the way he is, before returning to quotation of Genji’s thoughts and description of his state of mind in the final two clauses. It is true that the subject of clause (b) is different from that of clause (a), changing from Genji himself to his thoughts, kokoro no omoFinasi, however, the subject then changes back to Genji for clauses (c) and (d) as he is the one feeling confused and thinking about Fujitsubo. Clause (b), therefore, seems to have no SR marking at all. The ni element of niya, in spite of occupying a clause final position in this case, is not analysable as the -ni indicating DS.\(^1\) Nor is it possible to avoid the problem of lack of SR marking by analysing the part of the section up to niya as one sentence and the rest as another. Of three different Genji editions consulted,\(^2\) none chose to consider this the end of a sentence.

---


If we omit clause (b) from consideration, for a moment, on the grounds that it may be more of a parenthetic insert into the passage, SR marking does not seem to be working either. The subject of clause (a) is Genji, as are the subjects of clauses (c) and (d), and this in spite of the fact that they are separated by the DS marker -ni. None of these clauses contain any of the elements noted by Akiba and Fujii as allowing violations of SR marking, and consequently, it does not seem possible to describe -ni as a DS marker in this case.

On the other hand, clause (d) is expressing the result, confusion, of Genji’s thoughts concerning Fujitsubo, described in clause (c), and there is a major discontinuity between clause (a) and clause (b), given that the latter is an intrusion by the narrator. The interrogative particle, niya ending clause (b) by itself indicates discontinuity between clause (b) and clause (c).
Fujitsubo has decided that the only way she can be sure that Genji will stop pursuing her and which may also reduce Kokiden’s enmity, is to become a nun. Having made this decision she goes to see her son, the Crown Prince, for the last time as Empress. In spite of the presence of the markers -ni and -ba at the ends of clauses here, Fujitsubo is clearly the subject throughout the excerpt: she is the one deciding to become a nun; she is the one feeling upset at the prospect of taking orders without seeing her son first; and she is the one going to see him. All of these subjects are clearly indicated by the honorifics: the honorific verbs obositoru and obosu are used to describe the subject’s mental processes and movement is described using mawiritamaFu indicating movement by a person of high status (Fujitsubo) to a person of high status (the Crown Prince). Again, the clauses in question contain none of the elements noted by Akiba and Fujii as allowing violation of SR marking, but there is a strong element of temporal discontinuity between the clauses. Fujitsubo’s feelings about the Crown Prince, described in clause (b), are subsequent to, and the result of, her decision to become a nun. Her visit to the palace, described in clause (c) is the result of and subsequent to her feelings, described in clause (b).

Now let us move on to consider cases involving -ba.

(13) 人少けば、愛かしき物の後などにぞさぶらふ。2

---

1. Imazumi et al (1976) p219
2. Imazumi et al (1976) p217
The day after Genji’s visit to Fujitsubo, she is recovering with only a few servants around her. The subject of both the clauses above is Fito, “people”, here representing Fujitsubo’s ladies-in-waiting. The first clause is extremely short, consisting of the subject and the predicate, sukunasi, “be few”, here in its AF, sukunakere and with -ba affixed to it, only. It is these servants who are retained as the subject of the subsequent clause, as this is the only interpretation that makes sense. The verb, saburaFu, cannot apply to Fujitsubo, as she would only serve someone of higher rank, and she is the most highly ranked person present. Genji is watching her from a place of concealment, but this does not amount to serving her and, consequently, the only possible subject is the servants. Therefore, -ba cannot be marking DS in this case.

The two clauses are, however, semantically discontinuous in that the first clause is describing the servants’ numbers, whereas the second is describing their actions.

This excerpt is taken from the end of a long piece of Fujitsubo’s quoted thought. She has managed to get rid of Genji and he has responded by secluding himself in his palace. She is reflecting on the problems an estrangement between them will cause, and the disaster that will occur if Genji retires from the world completely.

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p219
It is possible to interpret the syntax of this passage in two ways, one of which would indicate a violation of SR marking, and one which would not. The question to be answered is whether the entire excerpt up to obositatu is a relative construction modifying the following noun koto, or if the only relative clause is Fitamitini obositatu. In the first case the two clauses would be on the same syntactic level, be separated by -ba and have Genji as their subjects, producing a violation of SR marking, although they would be discontinuous to the extent that the second clause describes a result of Genji’s potential action in the first. In the second case, the first clause would have Genji as its subject, but the second would have koto, and no main verb, although something like aramu might be understood from the context. That both of these interpretations are possible can be seen from the fact that Yamagishi (1958) opts for the latter, and Yanai et al (1993) for the former.

Fujitsubo is attempting to concentrate on religious matters and not to pay any attention to the brightness of the court as it celebrates the New Year festivities.

In this excerpt we have three separate clauses. Clause (a) is an expression of time, and concludes with the DS marker -ba, although it may be worth mentioning that it contains the past tense marker -nu, here in its PF of -nure and so according to

---

1 Yamagishi (1958) p388
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p229
Akiba, there could be a violation of SR marking here. This is not the case: the subject of clause (a) is *tosi*, "year", and that of clause (b) is *utiwatari*, referring to the imperial palace. The predicate of clause (b) is an adjective, *Fanayakanari*, here in its CF, *Fanayakani*. The unmodified CF of a predicate, or -φ as we have designated it, is indicative of SS reference. The subject of clause (c), however, is not the palace, but Fujitsubo, hearing of the palace ceremonies. Fujii would allow this violation of SR marking if the higher thematic referent of clause (b) and clause (c) was the same, but this is not the case as it does not seem that there is a higher thematic referent in this excerpt.

In fact, this excerpt comes at the beginning of a new section within the chapter as a whole, something which the editors have chosen to indicate by punctuating it as the beginning of a new paragraph. The previous section has concerned Genji and Fujitsubo, and so they can both be said to be still active in the discourse, but it seems doubtful whether either could be a higher thematic referent for clause (b), concerning the palace. It is not until clause (c), with its main verb *kiku*, requiring an animate subject, and the SH auxiliary *-tamaFu*, indicating that the subject is of high status that Fujitsubo is brought back into the foreground. Clause (c) itself actually concludes with the DS marker *-ni*, but the subject does not change: it is Fujitsubo who is finding the situation depressing. Consequently, it does not seem that in this excerpt that -φ is marking SS, or that -ni is marking DS.

It would be possible to argue, however, that -φ is not being used aberrantly here as given that no new agentive subject has been introduced since the last reference to Genji or Fujitsubo, there is no need for DS marking. Clause (a) is concluded with *-ba* because of the temporal discontinuity between it and clause (b), in that it is after the coming of the New Year that the palace becomes bright and cheerful. Then -ni is

---

1 Some recent work has suggested that -nu may not, in fact, be a tense marker and that it instead serves to indicate a spontaneous or self-generated change, a role it could be fulfilling here. See Quinn, Charles J. (1987) *A Functional Grammar of Predication in Classical Japanese*. unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Michigan
used to conclude clause (c) as there is a switch from Fujitsubo’s actions: hearing about the New Year festivities, to the effects of those action, her feeling depressed.

Here we have a case involving -wo.

(17) 仕うまつり給ふを、御心悩ましにことつけて

-wo

Fujitsubo wishes to go to court one last time in order to see her son, the Crown Prince, before she becomes a nun. As her major supporter, it would normally be Genji’s duty to see to the details of her visit, but he is still resentful over her treatment of him during his visit and so claims to be ill as a reason for not accompanying her.

Genji has been clearly established as the theme of this passage just prior to this excerpt with the phrase taishau no kimi Fa, so he is clearly the subject of the first clause. He is also, however, the subject of the second clause as no other interpretation is possible in the context: Genji has served Fujitsubo, and he is the one making a pretext of illness. Given the honorifics, the only other possibility, if there were a change of subject here, would be that Fujitsubo was the one making a pretext of illness. This, however, does not make sense as, if Fujitsubo were ill, she could not go to the palace. Consequently, Genji must be the subject of both clauses and -wo cannot be marking DS in this context.

In this case, though, it is more difficult to identify the area of discontinuity that -wo could be marking. The events described by the two clauses are not marked in the text as being temporally discontinuous, nor is spatial location relevant. The only area of discontinuity would seem to be that the eventuality of the second clause, Genji making an excuse of illness, is in strong contrast to his usual actions, serving Fujitsubo, described by the first clause.

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p220
Now let us consider some cases involving -do.

(18) 恨めしいう見給へど、何事も後見聞えならび給ひにたれば、
人あやしと見替めもこそすれと思して

Although he felt resentful towards her, he was accustomed to being her supporter so, thinking that people would notice and think it odd...

Following her rejection of him, Genji has been behaving coolly towards Fujitsubo, but he has just realised that this is politically unwise and might lead to unwanted rumours if allowed to continue.

Clause (a) has Genji as its subject, established by context and the SH auxiliary -tamaFe, and it ends with the DS marker -do. Clause (b) also has Genji as its subject, however, in that he supports Fujitsubo, and has become accustomed to doing so. Clause (a) contains none of the elements listed by Akiba and Fujii as allowing a violation of SR marking. In fact, Genji is also the subject of clause (c), in spite of clause (b) ending with -ba, but this can be explained by the presence of the past tense marker -nu, here in its CF of -ni. In fact, this could also explain the apparently anomalous usage of -do to conclude clause (a). Clause (b) is temporally discontinuous from clause (a) and clause (c), referring as it does to the events of the past, while the other two are situated in the present. Moreover, there could be an additional level of discontinuity if -nu is marking a spontaneous change. Clause (b) could be describing something that had simply happened to Genji over a period of time, while clause (c) refers to something he actually does.

(19) 気色見る人も有るべかめれど、煩はしけど、宮には、「
さなむ」とは啓せず。
Although there must have been people who knew the situation, they endured and said nothing to the lady. Genji has begun to visit Oborozukiyo at the home of her father, the Minister of the Right. Kokiden is living in the same palace and so the situation is dangerous for Genji. Oborozukiyo’s maids, however, do not wish to inform on her to Kokiden.

Clause (a) has Fito, “people”, as its subject. This refers to Oborozukiyo’s maids. The main verb is ari, “exist/be”, here in its AF, aru, and the clause concludes with the DS marker -do. The subject of the subsequent clauses, however, is also the maids, as it is they who are enduring the situation and not reporting it to Kokiden. Thus, -do does not seem to be acting as a DS marker in this context. Although ari is modified with two auxiliaries, -besi and meri, neither carries tense or aspectual meaning, nor is a copula present, meaning that none of Akiba or Fujii’s criteria for SR violation are fulfilled either.

Clause (a) does, however, exhibit a difference from the others in the excerpt. It is much less definite than the others, containing as it does two auxiliaries, meri and besi, both of which have the function of weakening the assertion being made by the clause: “no doubt, there were people who knew”. The second two clauses, on the other hand, are more definite: “they endured and said nothing”. Consequently, we can say that -do here is marking a semantic discontinuity between clause (a) and clause (b), even if it is not marking a switch of subject.

(20) と思うぞ、女君の心苦しき御気色を、とくに慰め堪え給ふ。1

to obose -do || wonnagimi no kokorogurusiki oFon-
Q think (SH) -although/DS || lady SUB desolate SH-
Genji's affair with Oborozukiyo has finally resulted in his being discovered in her bedchamber on the morning after a thunderstorm by her father.

The first clause in the excerpt, of which only the end is given, contains a long piece of quoted thought by Genji, musing on the problems this scandal is likely to cause him. The quotation is marked by the particle to and the clause's predicate is the SH verb obosu, "think", here in its PF, obose, followed by the DS marker -do. Genji is also the subject of the following clause, however, as it is he who is doing the comforting of Oborozukiyo. This is plain both from the context and the honorifics. Thus, -do is not marking DS in this case. As in the case of the previous excerpt, the first clause contains none of the elements which would allow a violation of SR marking according to Akiba and Fujii.

In the light of Stirling's analysis, however, it might be possible to argue that -do is here marking the difference between the actions described by the two clauses. The first clause is about Genji's thoughts, a mental, non-physical action; whereas the second concerns his comforting of Oborozukiyo, something he would have to physically do. It may be, therefore, that this is the type of change that -do is marking, rather than a switch of subject.

Finally, let us consider some cases involving -te.

(21) 疔ありて、思ひ聞え給ひにし後１

kizu ari -te || omoFi -kikoe tamaFi ni si noti
fault be -TSS || think -OH -SH P -T after

...she had her faults and, after he had thought about them...

In this case the first, short, clause has the subject kizu, "faults", and the main verb ari, "be/exist". The verb is in its CF and is followed by the SS marker -te. The subject of

---

1 Inuzumi et al (1976) p307
the second clause, however, is not Rokujo’s faults, but Genji, who is thinking about them. The use of -te here, then, cannot be accounted for by any of the conditions mentioned above: the subject is easily identifiable, the higher thematic reference of both clauses is different and kizu ari does not appear to be an idiom. A dictionary\(^1\) reveals the sole idiomatic expression involving kizu to be kizu wo motomu, “search out and criticise (someone’s) faults”. Consequently, it does not seem possible to describe -te as an SS marker in this context. As the faults are the object of Genji’s thoughts, however, it might be possible to speculate that here -te is indicating congruence between the subject of the first clause and the object of the second.

This excerpt does, however, occur within a piece of Genji’s quoted thought, in which he considers his relationship with Rokujo and how it has deteriorated since the death of Aoi, his wife. This would make him the agentive subject here, and -te could be being used to indicate that there has been no change.

This excerpt is taken from the middle of a piece of quoted thought, in which Rokujo is reflecting upon the circumstances of her life and which have brought her to this position. The structure of the passage is somewhat complex, given that the first section, from titi to -si is a relative clause modifying the noun arisama, “situation”.

Within that relative clause we find an example of -te indicating SS reference, in that it

---

\(^1\) Saeki et al (1980) p247

\(^2\) Imazumi et al (1976) p209–10
is Rokujo's father who both has the ambitions for her and raises her to meet them. For the second usage, on the other hand, this is not the case. The subject of the verb \textit{kaFaru}, “change”, is explicitly stated as \textit{arisama}. This cannot be the subject of the subsequent clause as the main verb is \textit{miru}, “see”, modified by the SH auxiliary \textit{-tamaFu}, indicating an animate subject of high social status. From the context, the only suitable subject is Rokujo herself. This violation of SR marking cannot be accounted for by any of the exceptions given above.

Prior to this excerpt, however, Rokujo has been established as the person doing the thinking, making her the agentive subject. The relative clause concerning her father’s actions is at a different syntactic level from the main clauses and, therefore, not part of their SR relationship. As there is no new agentive subject introduced by the clause \textit{arisama kaFarite} there is no need for DS marking upon it, and Rokujo is retained as the subject of clause (c).

\begin{center}
(23) 女房なども知らず集ひ参りて、今めかしはなやぎ給へど、御心のうちには、思の外なり事どもを忘れがたう欺き給ふ。2
\end{center}

\begin{verbatim}
maid etc too numberless gather -go (OH) -T/SS J bright
Fanayagi -tamaFe -do (c bFon- kokoro no uti Fa
make cheerful -SH -but/DS SH- heart P inside THE
omoFi no Foka nari -si kotodomo wo wasure -gatau
thought P outside be -T fact OBJ forget -difficult
nageki -tamaFu
grieve -SH
\end{verbatim}

...maids and others gathered in countless numbers, and Oborozukiyo behaved brightly and cheerfully, but in her heart she grieved over that chance meeting which she found difficult to forget.

Oborozukiyo has just been appointed to a position at the palace and is enjoying her new situation, although she is still haunted by her memories of her night with Genji.
some time before. The subject of clause (a) is clearly stated as nyubau nado, “maids etc.”, and it concludes with -te. The subject of clause (b), however, is clearly Oborozukiyo due to the presence of the auxiliary -tamaFu, which is definitely functioning as a SH marker and not an OH one here as can be seen from its inflection. SH -tamaFu is a 4G verb and OH -tamaFu is an L2 one. If it were functioning as an OH marker, it would in this context be -tamaFure-do and not tamaFe-do as we have here. Consequently, it is not possible to argue that the subject of clause (b) is still the maids and it must be Oborozukiyo. She is also the subject of clause (c), finding it difficult to forget her meeting with Genji and suffering as a result of it. Therefore, in this excerpt -te does not seem to be functioning as an SS marker, and nor is -do marking DS.

The excerpt, though, comes from a passage describing Oborozukiyo’s new chambers at the palace. She has just moved from the Tokaden (登花殿), an apartment to the north of the palace enclosure, to the Kokiden, previously occupied by her elder sister. The clause describing the fact that there are many maids in her rooms is just one of a list of descriptive facts concerning them. It might be possible to argue, therefore, that Oborozukiyo is the agentive subject here, as they are her rooms, and so -te can be used between clause (a) and clause (b). With regard to the anomalous usage of -do, there is a discontinuity between clause (b) and clause (c) in that there is a switch from the description of Oborozukiyo’s new rooms and her behaviour to the description of her thoughts, and this, rather than a change of subject, is what -do could be marking.

(24) あはれに思したれど、若うおはしますうちにも、御心なよひたるかた過ぎて、強き所おはしまきなるべし。¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(24) あはれに思したれたれど、若うおはしますうちにも、御心なよひたるかた過ぎて、強き所おはしまきなるべし。¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>あはれに思したれど、若うおはしますうちにも、御心なよひたるかた過ぎて、強き所おはしまきなるべし。¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>あはれに思したれど、若うおはしますうちにも、御心なよひたるかた過ぎて、強き所おはしまきなるべし。¹</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Imaizumi et al (1976) p215
...[the Emperor] was moved, but he was still young and of an excessively kind hearted disposition and undoubtedly there was no strength in him.

Following the death of the Kiritsubo emperor, Kokiden and her father, the Minister of the Right, enjoy untrammelled power due to their control over the young Suzakuin emperor. He is distressed by their actions, but unable to exert his own authority, as the above excerpt describes. He is the subject of clause (a) and the theme of the subsequent two. Suzakuin's presence as the subject of clause (a) is indicated by the usage of the SH verb *obosu*, "think". Similarly, in the subsequent two clauses his presence as theme is maintained by the continued usage of SH forms such as *oFasimasu* and *oFon-*; although, strictly speaking, one would have to say that the subjects of these two clauses are the nouns *kata* and *tokoro* respectively. The fact that these two clauses have different subjects, and are still linked by -*te*, is explained by the fact that their higher thematic reference, or agentive subject, is the same. The usage of -*do* at the end of clause (a) is, however, more problematic. It can be defined as a DS marker if one regards it as indicating a strictly syntactic relationship. At a discourse level, however, this is unsatisfactory as Suzakuin is so clearly retained as the theme of the excerpt.

(25) すこし気近き心地して...と宣ふもほの聞こゆれば、忍ぶれど、涙ほろほろとこぼれ給ひぬ。1

...he felt she was a little closer and, when she said...softly to him, although he hid it, his tears burst out.

---

1 Inouzumi et al (1976) p230
Genji has gone to visit Fujitsubo following her taking of holy orders, and is saddened by the situation in which they find themselves.

As was normal in Heian Japan, Genji and Fujitsubo are not communicating face-to-face, but with a curtain between them. They cannot see each other, and it would be normal practise for Genji to be sitting up against the curtain while Fujitsubo remained at some distance behind it. Genji is thus the one feeling that she is nearby and is the subject of clause (a). This clause concludes with the SS marker -te, but the subject of clause (b) switches to Fujitsubo. This is clear as she relates a poem, not quoted above, which is a reply to one that Genji has just composed. Clause (b) concludes with the DS marker -ba switching subject back to Genji, who weeps though he hides his tears. Clause (c) contains just the main verb, sinobu, here in its PF, sinobure, and ends with -do. Genji, however, is still the subject of clause (d), and so it seems that in this excerpt, -te is not marking SS and -do is not marking DS.

It may be, however, that the presence of the poem which, by its nature would reveal who was speaking it, can be considered sufficient to override any SR function held by -te. There is also a discontinuity between clause (c) and clause (d), in that clause (c) describes an action Genji actively does, hiding his tears, while clause (d) describes something that happens almost in spite of himself, the tears bursting out. His level of control over the eventuality in clause (d) is thus different from that of the clause (c), and it is this discontinuity that -do could be marking, rather than a switch of subject.

3.3.1 Switch Reference and Semantic Environment

During the course of this analysis it will have become apparent that many of the examples of apparent anomalous SR occurred in clauses featuring a particular type of semantic environment. Of the twenty examples given, fifteen involve predicates of either cognition or emotion.¹ Might it not, therefore, be possible that it is a

¹Examples 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24 and 25.
characteristic of LOJ cognito-emotive predicates that they should cause problems for SR analysis and, consequently, the presence of such predicates could be taken as another environment where anomalous SR marking will occur in LOJ.

In order to test this hypothesis, a brief survey of all the clause final predicates in the first five pages of our sample was conducted and those predicates with SR markers attached were noted. They were then divided into three categories: cognito-emotive, active and other, and the numbers for each were noted. The results are displayed below:

10. Partial Survey of Predicate Meanings in *Sakaki*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognito-emotive</th>
<th>Active</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the majority of all these predicates, however, SR marking is either not anomalous or, where anomalies occur, there is explicit subject marking to indicate changes of subject. Within this sample it is possible to find example of cognito-emotive predicates which present no problems for a SR analysis, such as:

(26) 大将は御有様ゆかしで、内裏にも参らまほぼう思せど\(^1\)

> taishau Fa oFon-arisama yukasiu -te uti ni mo 
> Genji THE SH- appearance be curious -T/SS palace to also 

> mawira -maFosiu obose -do 
> go (OH) -want think (SH) -but/DS 

Genji was curious about her appearance and felt like going to the palace, but...

and of active ones that do. For example:

(27) 中宮は涙に沈み給へるを、見奉らせ給ふにも様々御心乱れて思召さる。\(^2\)

> chuuguu Fa namida ni sidumi -tamaFe -ru wo mi tatematura 
> Empress THE be sunk in tears -SH -T OBJ see -OH 

> -se -tamaFu ni mo 
> -SH -SH when/DS P(EMPH) various SH- heart

---

\(^1\) Imaizumi d al (1976) p209
\(^2\) Imaizumi d al (1976) p211
When he saw the Empress sunk in tears, he was disturbed in various ways.

Consequently, it does not seem that the theory that SR anomalies may be linked to the semantic features of particular predicates is demonstrable. It may be possible to suggest that cognito-emotive predicates present a slightly greater likelihood of SR anomalies, however, we cannot conclude that they always will. One possible reason for the high number of such cases in our examples in Section 3.3 might be the high number of such predicates in the *Genji* generally. The text is, of course, largely concerned with the characters’ emotions, and so it is only natural that a large number of cognito-emotive predicates should occur.

Alternatively, it is certainly the case that even in MJ the exact nature of the subject of an adjective has been a topic of debate for a considerable period of time and it is the adjectival cognito-emotive predicates which have presented the most problems in our study, as in examples (6) and (7). If the exact nature of subject is difficult to define for this type of predicate, it seems logical that this would cause problems for a SR analysis.

### 3.4 Conclusion

From our examination of the literature on LOJ and SR, and our survey of SR in *Sakaki*, there are a number of points which seem to be clear. First, LOJ does not possess a canonical SR system. There are numerous cases where it is plain that SS markers are not indicating cojoint reference between the subjects of two clauses and, similarly, there are cases where DS markers do not indicate disjoint subject reference. Second, if the nature of SR is redefined along the lines proposed by Stirling, however, then the LOJ system does seem to fit with, in particular, the various DS markers indicating semantic discontinuities of various kinds between clauses, including but not limited to, change of subject. Similarly, aberrant SS marking does appear to occur.
in contexts where there is no change of agentive subject, even though syntactic
subjects may differ between clauses.

If one were to take the position, however, that an SR system would have to
comply with the canonical account in order to be considered an example of SR, then
we might be forced to conclude that SR does not exist in LOJ. It might be interesting
to consider, though, that canonical SR may have existed previously in Japanese.
Akiba’s results, mentioned earlier, indicating greater congruence between SS/DS
marking and syntactic subject in Taketori Monogatari, an earlier text, and Fujii’s
survey of Genji texts from later historical periods,1 indicating a lessening of SR
marking as the language approaches the modern period, suggest that SR in Japanese
has been going through diachronic change. If one were to examine a text from the
Old Japanese period, that is up to 794, then the SR system might be closer to the
canonical account than that of LOJ. By the LOJ period, however, the SR function of
the various markers had weakened to the point where other considerations, that is
discourse ones, could override any function they had of signalling retention/switch of
subject.

Regardless of which position we take, it is plain that SR marking by itself is
not sufficient in LOJ to disambiguate the subject reference of any clause and,
consequently, while it is of some use in reducing the vagueness of the text, it is not
decisive.

---

1 Fujii (1991) pp144–149
4.0 Introduction

It has been mentioned earlier that it is likely that Heian texts used no punctuation,¹ and other scholars have mentioned the difficulty of determining where the narrator is commenting upon the action, and where it is characters’ thoughts that are being described. One has even gone as far as to suggest that it is difficult to identify which character is speaking at any given point in a piece of text.² This would seem to be an indication of extreme vagueness in the language. The question arises, however, as to whether it was as difficult for readers in the Heian period to separate out the various streams of text from each other as it is for modern readers. Is it not possible that it was not, and there were “signposts” in the text of a linguistic nature which enabled Heian readers to determine the various levels of text?

We will, therefore, commence with a description of the syntax surrounding direct and indirect quotation in LOJ and then continue with an analysis of some passages of text in order to see if there are any consistent elements which could function to identify passages of speech and thought. We will then move on to consider the question of narrative versus authorial comment and again analyse some textual excerpts in an attempt to discover if there are any elements which set the narrator’s comment apart from ordinary narrative descriptions of events in the novel. We will also wish to examine some excerpts where modern editors actually disagree as to whether text is quotation or narration, and where there seems to be no marking of quotation at all.

¹ See Section 1.2
² See Miller, Roy Andrew (1982) p89
4.1 The Syntax of Quotation in LOJ

Quotation is one area where LOJ is remarkably similar to MJ. As in the modern language quotations are in the main marked with the particle to and followed by a verb indicating some kind of speech or mental process. For example:

(1) naFo si basi kokoromiyio to notamaFu -suru ni
further while try Q (say-SH) -SH when

「なら暂し休みよ」と言はするに
[The Emperor] said, “Try for a little while longer.”

(2) kaku nagara to mo nara -n wo goranji -Fate -n
such be whatever P be -T OBJ (see-SH) -finish -T
to obosimesu ni
Q (think-SH) when

かくならら、ともかくもならんを御覧じ果てんと思召するために
[The Emperor] thought, if it was to be he would see her to the end, whatever happened...

As in MJ it was not necessary for the verb to follow the particle directly, for example:

(3) tada waga wonna miko -tati to onaji tura
just my woman imperial child -PLURAL as same level
ni omoFi -kikoe -mu to ito nengoro ni
P think -OH -T Q very politely

kikoe -sase -tamaFu
(say-OH) -SH -SH

「ただ我が女御子たちと同じ列に思い聞いてゐ」といと怒ろに聞
えさせ給ふ。
[The Emperor] very politely said, “I will treat her just like one of my own daughters.”

---

1 Imazumi et al (1976) p3
2 Imazumi et al (1976) p4
3 Note that in both these examples the identity of the speaker/thinker is supplied by the presence of honorific verbs for say and think respectively.
Might this prince, if things go badly, even become Crown Prince, the First Prince’s mother thought doubtfully.

In keeping with the generally greater use of ellipsis in LOJ, however, it was quite common to omit a verb following a quotation if its meaning could be inferred from the context. For example:

(5) yoru itau Fuke -nure -ba koyoFi sugusa -zu oFon-night very become late -T as tonight pass -NEG SH-

As it is late, I will return and report to His Majesty before the night is over,” she said and went hurriedly.

(6) kakaru wori ni mo aru majiki haji mo koso to such time at even certain dreadful slight also P(EMPH) Q

Thinking, even at such a time there may be some dreadful slights...

Furthermore, as well as to, it was also common to use two particles, nado and tote, to mark quotations, as in:

(7) me mo mie -Fabera -nu ni kaku kasikoki eyes even be able to see -AH -NEG P such gracious

Thinking, even at such a time there may be some dreadful slights...

---

1 Imaizumi ct al (1976) p2
2 Imaizumi el al (1976) p8
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p3
"While my eyes are unable to see, these gracious words will be my light," she said, and looked (at the letter).

It is generally considered that both of the above particles were able to function as quotation markers because they contained the particle to. The tote construction is usually considered to be a contraction of either to iFite or to omoFite, while nado is usually considered to derive from nani to which explains the non-occurrence of combinations such as nado to and the like.

The examples given thus far, with the exception of the Emperor’s thoughts on keeping Kiritsubo with him, have all been examples of direct quotation. In other words they are a direct representation of the character’s speech or thoughts, instead of the narrator reporting what has been said or thought. When we consider indirect quotation, however, the situation is somewhat more complex. In a language such as English, for example, it is easy to distinguish between the two types of quotation as indirect quotation requires a congruency of tenses between the main and subordinate clauses, while direct quotation does not, as well as the fact that current orthographic conventions mandate that the two different types are represented differently in writing. For example:

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p6
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p7
In Japanese, however, the situation is quite different as the language does not require congruency of tenses between clauses in indirect quotation. To give Modern Japanese equivalents of the English examples above:

(11) Direct Quotation:
    “dekimasu” to itta.

(12) Indirect Quotation:
    dekiri to itta.

The only difference is that the polite style of the original has been placed into the plain style for the indirect quotation. If the speaker had originally been speaking in the plain style, the only difference between the two forms would be orthographic, and in the spoken language impossible to tell apart. Japanese does have other resources, though, in particular honorifics, so if there is a status difference between the speaker and the person reporting the speech, the following might occur:

(11a) Direct Quotation:
    “dekimasu” to osshatta.

(12a) Indirect Quotation:
    o-deki ni naru to osshatta.

The honorific equivalents for “say” and “be able to do” have been used, and as no one uses honorifics about their own actions, the second sentence must be an indirect quotation.

---

1 The situation is actually somewhat more complex than the version presented here. It occasionally happens that otherwise direct quotations of the speech of persons of very high rank, the Emperor, for example, will have honorifics inserted by the quoter in order to show extra respect to the person concerned. It also seems that in the Nara period it was possible for persons of high rank to use honorifics about their own actions when addressing persons of low rank in “control” type situations, the Emperor’s speech to the Old Man in Tatsukushi Monogatari being an example of this. By the Heian period, however, it seems that this phenomenon was no longer a feature of aristocratic speech. For more details on this point see: Tsujimura Toshiki (ed.) (1971) Kao Kokugo Shi Dai 5 Kan Keigo Shi Taiseikan Shoten, pp. 104-05
It has been suggested, however, that when dealing with Japanese examples it is possible to identify some quotations as a blend of both direct and indirect types, in that it is possible to retain imperative and interrogative elements in quotations which have otherwise been rephrased from the point of view of the person reporting the speech.\(^1\) For example:

(13) Taro ga yatsu no uchi ni sugo koi to denwa o kaketekita\(^2\)
太郎が奴のうちにすぐ来て電話をかけてきた
Taro called and said to come to his house immediately.

In the case of the above example Taro probably said ore no uchi ni sugu koi, using the imperative of the verb kuru, come, and ore, a casual male word for “I”. The person reporting the speech has retained the imperative but altered ore to yatsu, a male word for “person”, which stands to identify Taro in this case. Thus this is a blend of both direct and indirect quotation. The linguistic issues surrounding blended discourse are complex and somewhat technical, and not relevant to our discussion here. It is worth entertaining the idea, however, that to attempt to draw an absolute distinction between direct and indirect quotation is not suitable to a Japanese context.

In LOJ texts, due to the lack of punctuation, there was no orthographic distinction made between direct and indirect quotation of speech, as has been mentioned before.\(^3\) Due to the high incidence of honorifics, however, it is usually possible to distinguish between the two quite easily. In some cases, though, it is not possible to distinguish between indirect quotation of speech and thought due to the lack of a verb to identify what is being quoted. For example:

(14) mono no kokoro siri -tamaFu Fito Fa kakaru Fito
things P heart know -SH people THE such person
mo yo ni ide -oFasuru mono nari -keri to
even world in go out -SH person be -T Q
asamasiki made me wo odorokasi -tamaFu
surprising as far as eyes OBJ be astonished -SH

---


\(^2\) Kuno (1988) p76

\(^3\) See section 1.2
Either English translation is appropriate here. Furthermore, it is all but impossible to distinguish between indirect and direct quotation of characters' thoughts. In the light of what has been said above about blended discourse, however, it may be that such a distinction is not important. The question remains, though, as to how readers of LOJ were able to determine which parts of a text were quoted speech or thought, and which parts were not. This is the topic to be addressed in our next section.

4.2 Investigation of Quoted Direct Speech

In order to investigate the nature of quotation in LOJ it was necessary to select a corpus of text for study. It was decided to use the first four chapters of the novel, Kiritsubo (桐壺), Hahakigi (帯木), Utsusemi (空蝉) and Yūgao (夕顔) for this purpose, and all the examples of direct quotation of speech in these four chapters were noted. The speech of characters in the stories told during the “Discussion on a Rainy Night” were counted as being direct quotation for this purpose.

It has been theorised that there might be a grammatical feature which would allow LOJ readers to identify a piece of quoted speech from the surrounding narrative; consequently the text immediately preceding and following each quotation was noted and examined in an attempt to identify such a feature. It rapidly became apparent that there would be no difficulty in identifying the end of a quotation; of a total of 329 examples of direct quotation in the sample, we have the following possibilities for following text:

---

1 Imazumi et al (1976) Ibid. p9
1. Direct Quotation and Following Structures 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation followed by:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to + Verb of Speech</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tote</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nada</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nada + Verb of Speech</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tote + Verb of Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we cease to distinguish between the particles with and without verbs then the possibilities are even more limited:

2. Direct Quotation and Following Structures 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quotation followed by:</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tote</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nada</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus it seems that there were, in most circumstances, only three possible ways of following a direct quotation in LOJ, the particles *to*, *tote* and *nado* with or without a verb of speech of some kind. The other examples are either poems, which as we know were set apart from the rest of the text and could presumably be recognised as such from their structure, or took place in conversations with one quotation following directly upon another and were not of any great length, thus context would have made it obvious where one quotation ended and the next one started.¹

In the light of the above we must move on to consider how it was possible for LOJ readers to identify the beginnings of quoted speech. An investigation revealed that the following structures occurred before direct quotations:

¹ See section 4.2.3 for a more detailed discussion on this point.
3. Structures Before Direct Quotation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>24.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of sentence 1</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>36.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other quotation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures are only meaningful for our purposes if it could be shown that they differ significantly from the standard distribution of clause endings in the sample. It was posited that it might be possible to discover whether or not this was the case with a smaller excerpt from the main sample and the chapter *Utsusemi* was chosen for this purpose. The endings of all clauses in *Utsusemi* were examined, and compared with the endings of those clauses preceding directly quoted speech. Only those structures which occurred in both sections were compared, producing the following figures:

4. Structures Before Direct Quotation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Speech 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ba</td>
<td>9.94</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te</td>
<td>18.84</td>
<td>21.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-do</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of Sentence</td>
<td>29.84</td>
<td>40.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The significance of the above distribution was tested using a \( \chi^2 \) test, giving the result, \( \chi^2 = 7.9716 \). Consequently, the distribution of clause final structures preceding directly quoted speech is not significantly different from the normal distribution of clause final elements in the chapter, and thus there was no syntactic signpost immediately preceding examples of quotation in LOJ to inform the reader of what was coming up.

It has been mentioned earlier that LOJ had a very complex system of affixes in order to indicate tense and aspect, and furthermore that it was customary in Heian

---

1. Indicated by FF predicate or AF predicate following *kakari muashi* particle.
2. The results here seem to be roughly comparable to those of the sample as a whole, consequently it was thought that test results for *Utsusemi* ought to be equally true for the total sample.
literature to write narrative in a largely tenseless way. It was felt, therefore, that readers of LOJ works might have been able to separate quotation from narration by the presence of affixes indicating tense and aspect. Consequently, it was decided to test part of the sample to see if the distribution of tense and aspect affixes in directly quoted speech differed significantly from that in the text as a whole. The chapter *Kiritsubo* was chosen for this purpose and the numbers of tense and aspect affixes in passages of speech, and in the text as a whole were noted as follows:

5. Tense/Aspect Affixes and Quoted Speech 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Total Text</th>
<th>Quoted Speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures were then converted to percentages in order to test them with a $\chi^2$ test as follows:

6. Tense/Aspect Affixes and Quoted Speech 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>13.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>6.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>9.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>8.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>9.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures give a result of $\chi^2=20.022$ and thus there is a significant difference in the distribution of tense and aspect affixes in quoted speech compared with the text as a whole, and therefore it seems likely that these affixes played some role in allowing LOJ readers to separate quotation from narration.

If we narrow the study to consider the distribution of particular pairs of affixes, however, the results achieved are somewhat different:

---

1 See Section 1.3
7. Significance of Pairs of Affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affixes</th>
<th>Value of $x^2$</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -mu</td>
<td>4.896</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -ri</td>
<td>4.692</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -ki</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -tu</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -nu</td>
<td>4.329</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -ri</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -tari</td>
<td>3.892</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -ki</td>
<td>13.938</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -ri</td>
<td>4.696</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -ki</td>
<td>11.234</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ri</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ki</td>
<td>10.663</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri / -ki</td>
<td>13.734</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari / -ki</td>
<td>10.226</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -tari</td>
<td>1.188</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -nu</td>
<td>1.625</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -tari</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri / -tari</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -tu</td>
<td>2.192</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -nu</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -tari</td>
<td>1.184</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table it seems that the affixes -mu and -ki and are the ones whose distributions are most at variance between quoted speech and narration. In particular, if we consider the total number of appearances of the affix -mu in the chapter, as noted earlier of a total of 25 appearances, 9 occur in quoted speech. Of the remaining 16 appearances, 8 occur in quoted thought, leaving just 8 in straight narration. Thus it would seem that this affix was more likely to occur in quotation than narration.

If we turn to consider the instances of quoted thought in *Kiritsubo*, we find the following figures:

8. Tense/Aspect Affixes in Quoted Thought in *Kiritsubo*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Total Text</th>
<th>Quoted Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Converted to percentages for a $x^2$ test, we have the following:
9. Tense/Aspect Affixes in Quoted Thought in *Kiritsuibo* 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Total Text</th>
<th>Quoted Thought</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>6.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>9.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These figures give a value of $\chi^2 = 88.156$ indicating a significant difference in distribution between normal text and quoted thought. These results, however, may be considered somewhat suspect due to the small number of examples of quoted thought in the sample. Consequently it was felt that more informative results might be achieved if a test was made on the differences in distribution between normal text and all types of quotation. This produces the following figures:

10. Tense/Aspect Affixes in Total Text/Quotation 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Total Text</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Tense/Aspect Affixes in Total Text/Quotation 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total Text</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>14.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>36.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These give a value of $\chi^2 = 24.899$, again indicating a significant difference between the distribution of tense affixes in quotation and the text as a whole. If we then consider differences between particular pairs of affixes, we find the following:
12. Significance of Pairs of Affixes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affixes</th>
<th>Value of $x^2$</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -mu</td>
<td>12.802</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -ri</td>
<td>3.896</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -ki</td>
<td>5.602</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -tu</td>
<td>15.333</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -nu</td>
<td>12.707</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -ri</td>
<td>16.474</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -tari</td>
<td>12.853</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mu / -ki</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ri</td>
<td>6.427</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ki</td>
<td>8.133</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -tari</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ki</td>
<td>5.507</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri / -tari</td>
<td>3.947</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ri / -ki</td>
<td>9.274</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tari / -ki</td>
<td>5.653</td>
<td>Significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -tu</td>
<td>2.755</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -nu</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-keri / -tari</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -tari</td>
<td>2.806</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tu / -nu</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nu / -ri</td>
<td>3.801</td>
<td>Not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.1 Quoted Speech and Context

The results of the above survey seem to suggest that although there were some differences in syntax between quoted speech and narration, they were probably not widespread enough to allow Heian readers to always identify quoted speech on these grounds alone. It has, therefore, been theorised that the more general syntactic and textual context of pieces of quotation was sufficient, occasionally in conjunction with the tense and aspect differences mentioned above, to allow Heian readers to separate quotation from narration. Consequently, it is proposed to examine some excerpts of quoted speech in their textual context in order to see how easy it would have been to separate the quotation from the surrounding narration. For this purpose the first six pieces of direct speech in *Kiritsubo* were selected, excluding one that contains a poem, for the reasons given above.1

---

1 See section 4.2
This first, short excerpt is easy to identify as a quotation because the verb it contains is in the imperative form, which would not occur in narration. The verb is followed by the quotative particle to and a subject honorific verb of speech, notamaFu, identifying the end of the quotation. At the beginning we have the verb menaru, “get used to”, followed by the tense particle tu, which is thought to indicate, among other things, the conclusion of one event out of a series. Consequently, a reader would be expecting something new following it and when presented with two adverbs, which can only modify the following verb, would be able to identify them as being the beginning of the quotation.

The sentence before the quotation in the second excerpt has the Emperor as its subject. This has been clearly established through a series of honorifics and the sentence even concludes with the highly honorific construction -setamaFu, followed

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p3
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p3-4
by a negative suffix. Thus a reader knows who has been doing all the actions up to this point. Next we have a euphemism for death, kagiri aran miti, literally, “the road which will be certain”, followed by two particles *ni* and *mo*, which in this particular context can be translated “even on”. This phrase is followed by two verbs, *okuru*, “be left behind after someone has died”, and *sakidatu*, “die before someone else”. The second verb is modified by the negative particle *ji*, but as *okuru* is in its CF it would seem likely that *ji* modifies it as well. Subsequently, we have the quotative particle *to* and the verb *tigiru*, “swear”, again modified by the subject honorific combination -setamaFu and the tense particle *keri*. How then is a reader to interpret this passage?

The Emperor is known to be the subject from the context, and the presence of -setamaFu might seem to indicate him being the person doing the swearing, which would render a reading of the passage as:

He had sworn that he would not die and leave her behind...

But this does not make sense as it is not the Emperor who is dying. Furthermore, if the passage is narration, the subject of *tigirasetamaFu* cannot be Kiritsubo, as the honorifics are excessive for a person of her rank, particularly as the Emperor has been being discussed immediately prior to this section. Therefore, there are four other possibilities:

a) I have sworn that I will not die and leave you behind...
b) You swore you would not die and leave me behind...
c) We swore we would not die and leave each other behind...
d) They had sworn that one would not die and leave the other behind...

Of these four possibilities, three are quotations and one is narration. The first can be discounted because it is not the Emperor who is dying, leaving the last three. Earlier in this chapter Murasaki Shikibu has mentioned that the Emperor’s attachment to Kiritsubo had caused the Court to cite the example of Yang Kuei Fei against her, and any Heian reader would have known that she and the Chinese Emperor swore a vow that each would not die without the other. Consequently, b) can also be dismissed, leaving c) and d).
The phrase discussed above is followed by the conjunctive particle *wo*, and then a brief phrase, *saritomo utisutete Fa*. The verb here, *utisuteru*, means "to abandon". Given that it is Kiritsubo who is dying, she must be the one doing the abandoning. Noticeably, though, it does not have any honorifics attached to it, which one would expect if it were narration, as the narrator's persona is of a lower rank than the characters in the novel. Thus the lack of honorifics suggests that the phrase is being spoken of someone of a rank high enough not to have to use honorifics to Kiritsubo, and the only possibility here is the Emperor. Thus this must be quoted speech, and as this phrase clearly follows directly from the previous one, it too must be speech. With this fact now established, Heian readers would have continued to interpret the text as quoted speech until they came across the quotative particle *to* and the honorific verb of speech *notamaFasu*, which would further identify the Emperor as the person doing the speaking here.

At the beginning of this excerpt we have a quoted thought of the Emperor’s, identified as such by the honorific verb *obosimesu*. This is followed by the particle *ni*, which had a range of meanings after verbs, among which were “when...” or “while...”, which it has here. So, a Heian reader would have known that the following text was going to describe something that happened at the same time as the Emperor was thinking the thoughts that had just been described. They were then presented with a relative
clause, *keFu Fajimu beki*, modifying the noun *inoridomo*, “services”, creating “services which must begin today”. Next we have *sarubeki Fitobito*, “suitable people” and the OH verb *uketamaFaru*, “ask”. The subject of this verb could not be the Emperor, as there is no SH suffix attached here, so we have a possible interpretation:

...while he was thinking... (someone) had asked the appropriate people to perform the services which must begin today...

but this does not make sense. Asking priests to officiate at someone’s deathbed would have been a lengthy process and not something that could have taken place in the duration of a brief thought. Furthermore, *uketamaFaru* is modified by the past tense marker *-ri*, which clearly indicated that an action had taken place in the past, and thus could not have been taking place at the same time as the Emperor was thinking his thought. Consequently, the only possible interpretation is that people are saying this to the Emperor while he is thinking that he will keep Kiritsubo with him to the end, and this is confirmed by the presence of *to* and the OH verb of speech, *kikoyu*, afterwards.

(18)  
ibuse -sa wo kagiri naku notamaFasc -uru wo  
be inconsolable -P OBJ limit be not (say-SH) -T P  
yonaka utisuguru Fodo ni nan tac Fate -tamaFi -nuru  
midnight pass extent P P(EMPH) breathe -SH -T  
tote nakisawage -ba  
Q grieve noisily -when

...he spoke ceaselessly of his misery and when they said, “At just past midnight, she breathed her last,” weeping noisily...

This excerpt’s brevity makes it clear that it is quoted speech. Its context is that Kiritsubo has left the palace and the Emperor has sent a messenger to find out how she is. While waiting for the messenger to return, he speaks of his sadness, although

---

1Imaizumi et al (1976) p4
his words are not reported in any detail, merely as *ibusesa wo kagiri naku*.

The verb here has the tense particle *-tu* attached to it and is followed by the conjunctive particle *wo*, so Heian readers would have known that another event was about to take place. The statement that Kiritsubo died at just after midnight is followed immediately by the particle *to* and so they could only interpret it as a piece of speech.

(19) FaFa kita no kata onaji keFuri ni mo nobori nan to
mother principle wife same smoke in too rise P(EMPH) Q

母北の方、「同じ煙にも上りなん」と。
Her mother said, “I too, will rise in the same smoke,”...

This particular excerpt has the clearest possible marking of a piece of speech, in that the person doing the speaking, Kiritsubo’s mother, is actually explicitly identified. The subsequent clause cannot be narration as it would mean:

Her mother too, will rise in the same smoke...

in the context. Moreover, as with the previous excerpt, the shortness of the speech makes it easy to identify as such, the verb, *noboru*, is followed almost immediately by *to* thus clearly identifying the clause as a passage of quoted speech.

The above examination of excerpts of quoted speech seem to show that context was generally sufficient to enable readers to separate speech from narration, and in contexts where there might have been difficulties it was perfectly possible for the author to explicitly identify the speaker, or sometimes the addressee, in order to make her intended meaning more easily understood. In fact, the fact that such signposting does occur, but only in a minority of cases might be taken as evidence that the author felt that she had already given all the information necessary to enable readers to separate speech from narration in the text for the majority of cases.

---

1 Imadaumi et al (1976) p4
4.2.2 Disagreements over Quoted Speech

It has been mentioned earlier that, as with any classical text, there are some parts of the *Genji* where there is some disagreement between the various textual families as to the exact nature of the text. It is also the case that there are some points where different editors disagree over what is narrative and what is quotation. The differences are not particularly frequent: of 172 examples of directly quoted speech in *Kiritsubo* and *Hahakigi*, there are only seven where there is a difference of opinion between Yamagishi and Imaizumi. It was felt that it might be beneficial to examine some of these excerpts to see if it is possible to see which interpretation is more likely to be correct. For comparative purposes, the following editions were also consulted:

1. Mozume Takatomo (1924) *Genji Monogatari* Nihon Bungaku Soho Kankōkai
2. Ikeda Kikan (1951) *Nihon Koten Zensho* Genji Monogatari 1 Asahi Shinbunsha
3. Yoshizawa Yoshinori (1952) *Takko Genji Monogatari* Shinshaku Heibonsha
4. Tamagami Takuya (1964) *Genji Monogatari* Hiyoshaku Kodakawa Shoten

At this point perhaps mention should be made of the orthographic conventions adopted by the various editors. Yamagishi has obviously attempted to make the distinction between narrative and quotation as clear as possible by enclosing everything that he considers to have been spoken or thought by a character in quotation marks. This makes it all but impossible to determine what he considers to be indirect quotation and what direct, as well as what he considers to be speech and what thought when there is no verb present to make a clear distinction. The other editions enclose only direct speech in quotation marks or, as in the case of Tamagami (1964) use no punctuation at all in the original text, but punctuate the accompanying MJ translation.

The first excerpt occurs at Kiritsubo’s funeral:
おはしつきたる心地、いかばかりかは有りけん。「空しき御骸を見る見る、なほおはするものと発見がいかなければ、灰くなり給はんを見奉じて、今はなき人とひたるに思いなけれども、さかしら宜しきつれど」

...her feelings on arriving in that place, what must they have been?

"Seeing her lifeless body, it's pointless to think she's still alive, so when I see her become ashes, I'll come to believe wholeheartedly that she is gone," she said seriously, but...

Here, there is disagreement as to whether the quoted speech commences munasiki oFon-kara..., or naFo oFasuru mono to..., thus producing a translation:

On seeing her lifeless body, she said....

The various editions’ versions are as follows:

13. Excerpt 1: Versions A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>munasiki oFon-kara...</th>
<th>naFo oFasuru to...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozume (1924)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikeda (1951)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshizawa (1952)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagishi (1954)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamagami (1964)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe et al (1970)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaizumi et al (1976)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Imaiizumi et al (1976) p4
There is also little agreement among *Genji* translations. Seidensticker (1976) follows Yamagishi,¹ perhaps not surprisingly as it was this text which he used as a basis for his translation, but Yosano Akiko takes the opposite view,² while Waley (1935), always an idiosyncratic translator, turns the whole passage into narration.³

Let us then examine the passage to attempt to determine which of the two positions taken by the editors is more likely to be correct. The context of this passage is as follows: Kiritsubo’s body has been taken from her house to Otaki in order for the appropriate funeral rites to be carried out. Her mother is distraught with grief and has even accompanied the body in the same carriage to the cremation site. Once there, the rites are carried out with the utmost solemnity (*ito ikamesiu sono saFoFu sitaru*), the narrator then asks what must the mother’s feelings have been, and the sentence ends.

It very quickly becomes plain that there is a quotation here, as all the verbs referring to the Mother’s actions prior to this point in this section have had some kind of subject honorific marker attached, for example:

```
nakikogaretamaFite
sitaFinoritamaFite
ofasitukitaru
```

Here, however, we have her thoughts being described using *omoFu*; thus there can be no doubt that the section starting *naFo*... is a quotation. If the preceding phrase were narration, though, one might expect that there would be some honorifics present to indicate respect to the Mother. On the other hand, later on in the passage, the Mother refers to watching Kiritsubo’s body burn as *mitatematurite*, using an OH construction, and it seems odd that she would use honorifics for one act of seeing and not the other.

There is, however, a simple explanation for the seeming lack of honorifics in the construction in question, which Yamagishi refers to as “a duplicated Final Form adverbial” (*shushikei o kasaneta fukushi* (終止形を重ねた副詞)).⁴ A brief review of

---

¹ See Seidensticker (1976) p6
² 與謝野晶子 (1941) 全新源氏物語上 角川書店 (Yosano Akiko (1941) *Zen Yaku Genji Monogatari* 1 o Kadokawa Shoten), p11
³ Waley (1935) p10
⁴ 山岸泰平 (1958) 日本古典文学大系14: 源氏物語1 岩波書店 (Yamagishi Tokuhiei (ed)(1958) *Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei* 14: *Genji Monogatari* 1 Iwanami Shoten), p52
the other occurrences of *mirumiru* in the text reveals that, even in contexts where
honorifics are being used, *mirumiru* remains invariable. Consequently we can
conclude that there is certainly nothing unusual in having no honorifics here and then
mitatematurite later on. Furthermore, as there are no examples of *goranzugoranzu* or
*mitamaFumitamaFu* in the text, one can assume there was no SH equivalent for
*mirumiru*. An examination of its various usages indicates that its basic meaning
varies between “see constantly” and “keep on looking at”, for example:

(21) masite koko ni nado saburaFi -nare -tamaFu wo
indeed here in etc be -get used to -SH OBJ

mirumiru mo Fajime no kokorozasi kaPara -zu Fukaku
see P beginning P feelings change -NEG deep

nengoroni omoFi -kikoe -taru wo
kindly think -OH -T CONJ

I have watched while you have become accustomed to being here, and
my first feelings of affection have not changed, they are more deeply
and strongly felt...

(22) sono inoti tac -nu wo mirumiru sute -n koto
that life die -T OBJ see abandon -T fact

imijiki koto nari
be dreadful fact be

It would be a dreadful thing to abandon her and watch her until she is
dead.

Given that *mirumiru* has this meaning, then it would have been possible for the author
to use an alternative construction if she had wanted to make it clear that the passage
was narration and not quotation; for example, *goranjitutu* is an SH construction with
roughly comparable meanings, and which does occur elsewhere in the text.³

Furthermore, if one examines the usages of *mirumiru* in the text, one finds that it

---

¹Imaizumi et al (1976) p676
²Imaizumi et al (1976) p1242
³Imaizumi et al (1976) p907
occurs ten times and of those usages three are unequivocally narration,¹ six are quotation,² and one is the disputed passage above. The fact that the majority of usages clearly occur in quotation is further evidence to suggest that the passage above is also quotation. When taken together with the sudden absence of honorifics, and the fact that one might expect an answer to follow the narrator’s question, it does seem that the Imaizumi-Abe interpretation is the correct one.

(23) imaimasu kataikenaku nado notamaFu miya Fa oFotonogomori be unlucky be impious Q prince THE (be asleep-SH)
-ni -keri mi -tatematuri -te kuFasiku oFon- arisama no
-T -T see -OH -T clearly SH- appearance too
sousi -Fabera -maFosiki wo mati -oFasimasu -ran
(say-OH) -AH -want but wait -SH -probably
wo yoru Fuke -Faboti -nu -besi tote isogu
as night get late -AH -T -must Q hurry

"...it would be unlucky and impious," said the Mother. "It seems that the Prince had gone to bed. I had wanted to see him and give His Majesty a detailed report on his appearance but, as His Majesty will probably be waiting, and it must have become quite late..." she said and hurried.

This excerpt occurs during a long conversation between Kiritsubo’s mother and a Myōbu, a messenger from the Emperor. The disagreement is between the position given above, or whether the Myōbu’s speech starts from mitatematurite, and that the previous sentence is narration. This would produce a translation:

"...it would be unlucky and impious," said the Mother. It seems that the Prince had gone to bed. "I had wanted to see him and...
14. Excerpt 2: Versions A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>$miya \ Fa...$</th>
<th>$mitematurite...$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozume (1924)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikeda (1951)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshizawa (1952)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagishi (1954)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamagami (1964)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe et al (1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaizumi et al (1976)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanai et al (1993)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disputed sentence starts with the word $miya$, “prince”, which is followed by the particle $Fa$, establishing Genji as a theme for what follows. Next come the SH verb $oFotonogomoru$, “go to bed”, “sleep”, in its conjunctive form and modified by a combination of two tense affixes, $nu$ (in its conjunctive form $ni$) and $keri$. There are two major points to be considered here, that of the honorific usage, and that of the tense affixes. First, it would be consistent for the Myobu to be using an honorific about Genji, who is the Emperor’s son and at this stage still a prince. It would also, however, be consistent for the narrator to use an honorific here, as the narrator’s rank is assumed to be that of a court attendant. Consequently, honorific usage provides no conclusive evidence either way.

Tense usage, on the other hand, seems somewhat more illuminating. The affix $nu$ is generally taken to pinpoint an action as having taken place in the recent past and $keri$ to be a marker of subjectivity, in other words that the speaker/writer is making no claims as to the objective truth of what they are saying. Alternatively, it is said to mark “hearsay”, or that it indicates a sudden realization of some fact, or that it is used when explaining the reason for something that was not understood at the time. All of these interpretations have the common element that $keri$ indicates something which the user is not certain or sure about, either at the time of use or in the past. Given that

---

1 Tamagami notes in his commentary that the other interpretation exists, but fails to say why he has chosen as he has. See 玉上琢磨 (1964) 源氏物語評介 花岸善行 (1964) Genji Monogatari Hyobaku Kodokawa Shoten p69
this is the case, it seems strange that the sentence above should be narration. While the narrator does use *keri* on occasion, it is not usual for it to be used where simple matters of physical action are concerned. For example:

(24) naFo waduraFasiu kokorogurusiu omoFi -kikoe -sase
    particular be dreadful be painful feel -OH -SH
    -tamaFi -keru
    -SH -T

    [The Emperor] felt [her reproaches] to be particularly hurtful and wounding, [apparently].

The narrator is discussing the Emperor's reaction to Kokiden's reproaches following the shift of his affections to Kiritsubo. This is obviously a different sort of situation from a character's going to sleep. Similarly:

(25) sugurete tokimeki -tamaFu ari -keri
    exceedingly be favoured -SH be -T

    ...すぐに時めき給ふありけり。²
    ...there was one who was favoured above all.

This excerpt comes from the novel's very first sentence, and *keri* can be seen as having the purpose of establishing the entire tale as fiction, but as above, the matter of a character's existence is not a physical action.³

To return to the passage under discussion though, a person in the Myōbu's situation, sitting in a room and talking to Kiritsubo's mother without Genji present, would not know whether or not he was asleep, although it would be a fair assumption, considering the lateness of the hour, and thus using *keri*, to indicate that she was not certain of the truth of her statement, would seem to be a logical linguistic choice.

---

¹ Imaiizumi et al (1976) p2
² Imaiizumi et al (1976) p1
³ At the time of the Genji's writing, *keri* did have the meanings ascribed to it above, but often these just added a tiny nuance to the meaning of an entire sentence and to attempt to reproduce this in an English translation runs the risk of making the nuance stronger and more intrusive than it was in the original. Consequently, *keri* has not been translated by any specific element in the passage above, and even in the former passage, *apparently* probably has more force to it than *keri* did.
A further argument for the sentence being quotation, and not narration is that, if it were narration, it is the only piece in the middle of a long conversation which does not refer to the two characters concerned, or the Emperor’s letter, which the Myōbu has brought. Thus if it were narrative we would have:

(26)  
geni e- taFu -majiku nai -tamaFu yaya tameraFi  
really NEG- endure -NEG weep -SH a bit calm oneself
-te oFosegoto tutaFe -kikoyu oFon- Fumi tatematu
-T (speech-SH) tell -OH SH- letter (give-OH)

[..] mi -tamaFu [..] komayakani kaka -sc -tamaFe -ri
see -SH in detail write -SH -SH -T

[e- mi -tamaFi - fate -zu [..] miya Fa
NEG- see -SH to the end -NEG prince THE

oFotonogomori -ni keri [..] isogu [..] iFi mo yarazu
(sleep-SH) -T -T hurry say P to the end

musekaiFer -tamaFu Fodo ni yo mo Fuke -nu
be choked with grief -SH while P night P get late -T

[..] katari -te tuki se -zu nakunaku [..]
tell -T finish do -NEG weeping

isogi mawiru
hurry (go-OH)

[speech] the Mother wept as if she really could not bear it [speech] the Myōbu calmed herself somewhat and told her the Emperor’s message [speech] the Myōbu gave her the Emperor’s letter [speech] the Mother looked at the letter [speech] the Emperor had written in detail [speech] the Mother could not read it to the end [speech] it seems the Prince had gone to bed [speech] the Myōbu hurried [speech] while the Mother was unable to finish speaking from grief, the night became late [speech] the Myōbu did not finish telling her. Weeping, the Mother [speech] the Myōbu left hurriedly.

It does seem to be a rather abrupt change to suddenly mention Genji in narrative, when there is no mention of him previously or subsequently, whereas it would make more sense in quotation as he has been a topic of discussion between Kiritsubo’s Mother and the Myōbu.

(27)  
nadusaFi mi -tatematura -ba ya to oboe -tamaFu  
get attached to see -OH -if ? Q feel -SH

uFe mo kaigininaki oFon- omoFidoti ni -te
emperor too above all SH- friendly relationship be -T
In this excerpt the disagreement lies in whether the Emperor’s speech begins as it is given above, or whether the clause kagirinaki oFonomoFidoti nite actually applies to him and the speech starts with the imperative, producing a translation:

The Emperor too, was inordinately fond of them both, and said, “Don’t despise him...”

If we examine other sources, then we find the latter to be by far the most common interpretation:

15. Excerpt 3: Versions A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>uFe mo...</th>
<th>na utomitamaFi so...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozume (1924)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikeda (1951)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoshizawa (1952)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamagishi (1954)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamagami (1964)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abe et al (1970)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imaizumi et al (1976)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even among the translators Yosano Akiko, in her modern Japanese translation, follows the second interpretation, as do both Waley and Seidensticker, although they seem to have had difficulty over the preceding clause as both have omitted to translate it. Suematsu too, relates it to the Emperor, but bizarrely then continues by

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p14
2 Yosano (1941) p25
3 Waley (1939) p17
4 Seidensticker (1976) p16
making the subsequent speech indirect instead of direct quotation\(^1\), a position taken by no-one else. Among the various editors, the only detailed comment is from Tamagami, who acknowledges the existence of the other interpretation, but dismisses it as, in his opinion, \textit{omoFudoti} can only refer to the Emperor's feelings and, consequently, the presence of the honorific \textit{oFon-} means the passage must be narration as otherwise the Emperor would be using honorifics to refer to himself.\(^2\) He does not appear to have considered the possibility that the Emperor may have been talking about someone else and applying honorifics to them. With such a body of opinion for one interpretation, it would seem that it must be the correct one, but why then has Imaizumi chosen the other? Let us examine the clause in question.

First, we have the noun \textit{uFe}, a euphemism used to refer to the Emperor, this is followed by the particle \textit{mo} which had a variety of meanings, of which two could apply here, indicating either “even” or “as well”. Then comes the adjective \textit{kagirinasi}, which can be interpreted as meaning either “limitless” or “above all”, which is modifying the noun \textit{omoFudoti}, which is also modified by the SH prefix \textit{oFon}, indicating that the noun applies to someone of high rank. Unfortunately, however, it tells us no more than that as both the Emperor and Genji have had \textit{oFonomoFudoti} refer to them previously. If it were possible to use \textit{obosu} instead of \textit{omoFu} then it would have pointed much more clearly to the Emperor, due to the higher level of honorifics. The noun is followed by the copula \textit{nari} in its CF with the tense affix \textit{tu}, also in its CF, attached, producing \textit{nite}. This is an explanation of the grammar glossed above.

We have already shown that both names and the affix \textit{tu} occur before quotations, and that we cannot point to either as indicating that what follows is a quotation, thus neither \textit{uFe mo} nor \textit{nite} is of use to us. So we are left with \textit{kagirinaki oFonomoFudoti}. The noun \textit{omoFudoti} is usually considered to mean the same as the similar \textit{omoFudoti}, which is defined as referring to the feeling that exists in a

---

\(^1\) Suemitsu (1974) p32
\(^2\) Tamagami (1964) p129
relationship between close friends.\(^1\) In order to check that this is correct, it has been decided to examine the other occurrences of these words in the text in the hope that it might shed some light on this occurrence.

Unfortunately, a survey of the *Genji* reveals that *omoFudoti* only occurs once in the entire text,\(^2\) *omoFudoti*, on the other hand, occurs four times,\(^3\) so let us examine these instances for what they may tell us. The first instance is from *Akashi* (明石):

\[(28)\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{miti no} & \text{Fodo} & \text{no} & \text{yomo} & \text{no} & \text{uraura} & \text{miwata}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{path} & \text{surroundings} & \text{all sides} & \text{bays} & \text{see from afar}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{-tamaFi} & \text{te} & \text{omoFudoti} & \text{mi} & \text{-maFosiki} & \text{irie no} & \text{tukikage}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{-SH} & \text{-T} & \text{see} & \text{-want} & \text{inlet} & \text{P} & \text{moon shadow}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{ni mo} & \text{madu} & \text{koFisiki} & \text{Fito no} & \text{oFon- koto wo}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccccc}
\text{P} & \text{P} & \text{first} & \text{beloved} & \text{person} & \text{SH- fact OBJ}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{omoFiide} & \text{-kikoe} & \text{-tamaFu} & \text{ni}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{remember} & \text{-OH} & \text{-SH} & \text{CONJ}
\end{array}
\]

This excerpt describes Genji’s thoughts as he rides off one evening to see Lady Akashi. It is clear from the grammar that *omoFudoti* represents a person, as the affix *maFosi*, “want”, is in its attributive form, thus indicating that *omoFudoti mimaFosiki* is a relative clause modifying *irie*, producing “bays which *omoFudoti* would want to see”. Immediately following this excerpt, Genji recites a poem which makes it plain that the person in his thoughts here is Murasaki, who he had to leave behind in the capital when he began his exile. Thus it would seem clear that here *omoFudoti* is being used to mean something like “the person who is the object of one’s affections”, “one’s beloved”. The next usage suggests a similar meaning as well. This comes from the following chapter, *Miotsukushi* (潮攝) where Genji has returned to the

---


\(^2\) 池田森(著) (1953) 道氏物語大成 中央出版社(Tsukada Kikkan (1953) Genji Monogatari Taigi (Volume 4), Chuo Koron Sha), p.49

\(^3\) Ikeda (1953) p.58

\(^4\) Inaizumi et al (1976) p289
capital and has just told Murasaki of his affair with Lady Akashi. Naturally enough, she is not pleased to hear this news, and recites the following poem to express her feelings:

(29) omoFudoti nabiku kata ni Fa ara -zu tomo ware
be blown direction to THE be -NEG P I
zo keburi ni sakidatni -namasi
P(EMPH) smoke in rise first were it to be

思ふどち靡く方にはあらずとも我ぞ煙に先立ちなまし

omoFudoti
nabiku kata ni Fa
arazu tomo
ware zo keburi ni
sakidatinnamasi

Were I in smoke
The first to rise
It would not be
To your omoFudoti
That I would drift

It seems clear that here Murasaki is using omoFudoti to refer to Lady Akashi, and is saying with her poem that Genji has forgotten her and transferred his affections elsewhere during his time away. Similarly, in the following excerpt from Wakana Ge (若菜下):

(30) Fito yori otosi -te obositate -si yori no omoFudoti
person from despise -T desert -T since P
no oFon- monogatari no tuide ni
P SH- talk P occasion P

...ひとより貶して思い捨てしよりも、思ふどちの御物語のつい
にて...^2
...I have been despised by people and since you turned your back upon me, on occasions when you have been talking with your omoFudoti...

Lady Rokujō’s ghost is here reproaching Genji for having spoken disparagingly of her when speaking to Murasaki, and the word omoFudoti is used to refer to her. The final

---
^1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p308
^2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p728
usage though, is a bit more difficult to interpret. It comes from Yūgiri (夕霧), where
Yūgiri has been pursuing Kashiwagi’s widow Ochiba and has sent her a letter:

(31) ikanaran to omoFudoti kono oFon-seusoko no
what be -T Q this SH-letter SUB

yukasiki wo Fiki mo ake -sase -tamaFa -ne
eager to know CONJ pull P open -CAUSE -SH -NEG

-ba kokoronotonaku
-as be impatient

...いかならんと、思ふどち、この御消息のゆかしき引きもあ
けさせ給はねば、心もとなく...

...what could it be, omoFudoti, they were eager to know about the letter
and when she didn’t pull it to her or have it opened, impatiently...

Ochiba’s ladies-in-waiting are extremely eager to know the contents of Yūgiri’s letter
and are impatient with their mistress’s lack of interest in it. In this case omoFudoti
seems to be standing on its own in the sentence with no real connection with anything
else. Imaizumi has indicated the word’s ‘semi-detached’ nature by punctuating the
sentence as ikanaran to, omoFudoti, kono oFon-seusoko, as has been shown in the
Japanese above. The most likely explanation is that in spite of the fact that the
quotative particle to has been placed immediately before it, omoFudoti is still an
indirect quotation from the women’s minds, indicating what they are wondering about
the letter’s meaning. The women are aware that the letter has come from Yūgiri, and
also that something has happened between him and their mistress, thus it could mean:

...what could it be...[are they] lovers, perhaps [they wondered] and were
eager to know about the letter...

omoFudoti does not seem to be being used to refer to a particular person, but instead
to the state of the relationship between Yūgiri and Ochiba.

The above survey would seem to suggest that the most common usage of
omoFudoti was to refer to one single person whom someone loved deeply. Given that
this is the case and that omoFudoti had the same meaning then the only possible
interpretation of the passage from *Kiritsubo* is that it is the Emperor speaking and referring to Genji’s feelings for Fujitsubo, saying:

You are the one he likes above all, don’t despise him for it.

The passage cannot be narrative referring to the Emperor’s feelings as there is no indication of who, Genji or Fujitsubo, he likes best, quite apart from the fact that we know that this is not true and that he loves them both. Consequently, Imaizumi’s interpretation of the text must be taken as correct.

4.2.3 Unmarked Speech

In this section we will address the question of how it was possible for Heian readers to decipher conversations where one piece of speech followed another without any particles or verbs of speech to separate them. To this end two excerpts have been chosen, both from the *Hahakigi* chapter at the beginning of the novel, and it is proposed to analyse both in order to see what features they possess to indicate where one character has stopped and another started speaking. In modern editions such separations are marked by punctuation, but in the original text, of course, this would not have been present.

The first excerpt is taken from the section where Genji has gone to Ki no Kami’s house and is talking to him prior to retiring for the night.

(32) nado monogatarisi -tamaFi -tutu idukata ni zo mina etc tell -SH -T where P (EMPH) everyone

servants’ quarters ni orosi -Faberi -nuru wo e-

ya- makari -ori -aFe -zara -n to kikoyu?

... while Genji was telling him this,

 "Where have they...?"

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p41
"They were all to have gone to the servants' quarters, but they can't all have gone yet," he said.

This is a brief exchange that occurs during a long conversation between the two characters. Genji has been probing for information about his host's stepmother, and has just made a speech marked with the first verb in the excerpt, of which he is clearly the subject due to the honorific. Incidentally, some Genji texts here have this verb ending with te, the conjunctive form of the past tense marker tu, which might make more sense than the tutu, "keep on doing" given here, producing a translation:

...said Genji, then,
"Where have they...?"
"They were all to have gone to the servants' quarters, but they can't all have gone yet," he said.

Be that as it may, the verb is followed by an interrogative word, idukata, "where", which is followed by two particles, making a very casual question. This is followed by an answer to the question, which is clearly identified as being said by Ki no Kami due to the presence of the AH verb Faberi in the speech and the OH verb kikoyu, "say", used to mark it. In such a context, as Genji and Ki no Kami are the only characters present in the conversation, the question can only have been asked by Genji. The alternative interpretation, that Ki no Kami was asking himself the question, trying to remember where he had sent the women, would mean that he was being rather impolite to Genji, by ignoring what he had just been saying and changing the subject. This would have been inconceivable considering their relative social positions, and consequently this interpretation can be discounted. Thus it can be seen that here there is no need for Genji's speech to be explicitly marked as such, the context and surrounding syntax supplies all the information necessary to identify who is speaking to whom. This would seem to be in keeping with the whole thrust of the LOJ style we have identified, of not including anything explicitly if it can be derived from information already present in the text.

(33) mune tubure -te obose -do sono ane -gimi Fa chest pound -T (think-SH) -although that sister -SH THE
This excerpt comes a little while after the previous one, when Genji has seduced Utsusemi and is considering how he can manage to get in touch with her without arousing anyone’s suspicions. Consequently, he is suggesting to Ki no Kami that he should take Utsusemi’s younger brother, Kogimi, under his wing. Ki no Kami has just played into Genji’s hands by suggesting that maybe he should mention the matter to his stepmother and thus allowing Genji to ask about her. There are two main features here which enable readers to decipher where one character’s statements end and the other’s start.

First, most obviously, there is the presence and absence of honorifics. One character’s speech is marked by the absence of any honorific usage, whereas the other’s contains the AH verb Faberi and the OH verb tamaFu. Obviously then, we...

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p16
2 In the original Genji uses two different words for ‘beautiful’ here, one of which, yosi, is generally taken as being slightly stronger in meaning than the other, yorosiku. It is possible then, that here he is actually saying something along the lines of “One hears she’s beautiful, is it true she’s fabulous?"
are dealing with one character of high rank and one of low. The second feature is that, as LOJ verbs and affixes had clear final forms used only at the end of sentences, it is relatively simple to identify the ends of each character’s speeches, particularly so as predicates occupy sentence final position in LOJ, as with MJ. Thus Genji’s first piece of speech in the excerpt is clearly identified as such due to the fact that the final verb, *motu*, has no honorifics attached and it clearly ends where it does as the affix *ru* is in its FF of *ru*. Furthermore, this piece of speech is marked as a question due to the presence of the interrogative particle *ya*, thus what follows must be an answer to the question posed, and there is no need for an explicit particle or verb to mark this as speech.

The next sentence is clearly spoken by a different person as it contains *Faberi*, as does the following one, marking the speaker as low rank, and as Genji and Ki no Kami are the only two people present, it must be him. His second sentence ends with the OH auxiliary *tamaFu*\(^1\) in its attributive form instead of its FF due to the presence of the particle *nan*, which requires a sentence final predicate in AF, the so-called *kakari musubi* relationship, earlier on. Following this verb we get a clear shift of speaker due to the return to a much more casual style of speech with no honorifics. Again, this obviates the need for a particle or verb to mark the boundary of the two characters’ speeches as the surrounding grammar does well enough without. The final piece of speech in the excerpt does have a particle and verb of speech following it, the SH verb *notamaFu*, identifying Genji as the speaker.

Thus it can be seen from the two examples studied above that it was not always necessary for speech to be explicitly marked as such with particles or verbs. It is probably true to say, however, that such conversations had to be kept short and also be between two characters of varying ranks so that honorifics and other syntax could play an appropriate role in allowing readers to determine which character was speaking at which point. This is born out by the evidence in the text, all but one of

---

\(^1\) The verb *tamaFu* is clearly OH and not SH here due to the fact that its AF is *tamaFuru* and not *tamaFu*, thus placing it in the L2 conjugation and not in the 4G one.
the similar conversations in the first four Genji chapters are between Genji and Ki no Kami, and the other is between Genji and Koremitsu, and all consist of no more than three pieces of speech as in the second excerpt above.

4.3 Conclusion

In this chapter we have examined the question of whether the LOJ system of quotation can be described as being vague. An examination of the syntax of quotation has indicated that there were structural features which clearly marked the ends of quotations, and has suggested that the quotations themselves had a different distribution of tense and aspect affixes which would have served to set them apart from narrative, although the exact nature of this is a topic which requires further study. An investigation of quotations in their textual contexts has indicated that, in addition to the syntactic features already discussed, the context in which quotations appeared also played a role in identifying them, particularly in cases where syntactic features were absent. Consequently, LOJ cannot be said to be vague on either the syntactic or pragmatic levels where quotation is concerned. The fact that it is still possible for disagreements to occur between modern editors as to where quoted speech begins and ends, however, demonstrates the fact that our understanding of the mechanisms of quotation in LOJ is as yet, still imperfect.
Chapter Five

Character Reference

5.0 Introduction

One of the areas in which the *Genji Monogatari* is most different from a western novel is the way the characters are referred to in the text. None of the major characters is given a personal name; instead “a shifting series of sobriquets or designations”¹ are used. These derive from various sources, for men the most common being their current court position; for women, the place where they live. Another common possibility is that the sobriquet comes from a poem in which the character has been mentioned. Obviously, then, as characters change dwellings and ranks the ways in which they are referred to change also. This is the major reason why ‘nicknames’ have been attached to the novel’s principal characters, so that when they are being discussed it is possible to have a common form of reference for them. Thus we have “(Hikaru) Genji” for the novel’s hero, “Murasaki (no Ue)” for his greatest love, “Tō no Chūjo” for his best friend and rival, and so on for the other characters.

It might seem that, provided that changes in characters’ ranks are mentioned in the text, it should not be impossible to decipher who is being referred to at any particular point. Unfortunately, however, the situation is even more complex. *Genji* appears in the first 41 chapters of the novel, from the point of his birth to just prior to his death, during this time the total number of sobriquets used to refer to him is 217,² an average of just over five different sobriquets in every chapter. The question which this chapter will attempt to answer is why did Murasaki consider it necessary to use so many different ways of referring to her characters? First, however, we will need to discuss the norms of Heian personal reference, in order to see how far the *Genji Monogatari* is at variance from them.

² See (1960) Genji Monogatari Jiten (Volume 2), Choro Kōron Sha
5.1 Personal Reference in Heian Japan

When one considers Heian sources, it does seem that particularly in court circles, there was some kind of taboo against mentioning the personal names of superiors, although it seems that this tendency developed quite late on in the Heian period as earlier monogatari such as Utsubo Monogatari (宇津保物語) and Taketori Monogatari (竹取物語) do use personal names for high ranking characters. In fact, it has been suggested that the Genji was not representative of actual usage of the time. Murasaki Shikibu wanted to give the impression of the cultured nature of court life and so did not use personal names for her characters and later authors simply copied her style. Whether this is true or not, Heian works show us that there were various ways of referring to people: men were often referred to by their court position, in combination with either their personal name or the name of the place where they lived, with the optional addition of an honorific suffix. For example:

(1) Forikawa no chuujau sachujujau marinobu no kimi
    marinobu no chuujau

The Middle Captain from Horikawa
Left Middle Captain Lord Narinobu
Middle Captain Narinobu

More rare, but still seen occasionally would be the combination of personal name and honorific suffix, Narinobu no Kimi "Lord Narinobu", and the like.

For a woman, the tendency was to use the name of the place where she lived as a euphemism for her, often with the addition of an honorific suffix. Thus Fujiwara Michinaga’s wife is variously referred to as Takamatsu-dono or Takamatsu-dono no uFe, which translate loosely as "the Lady from the Takamatsu Palace". A similar tendency is shown in Genji; Fujitsubo’s ‘name’ is that of the rooms she first occupies in the Imperial Palace.

We have mentioned two honorific suffixes so far, -kimi and -dono. Of these, -dono was the more honorific, carrying a clear sense of the Lord-Vassal relationship; -kimi on the other hand, had degenerated from being a very honorific expression in

---

2 In some contexts these would be pronounced -gimi and -dono respectively.
earlier periods to the level of an equivalent to modern -san. In the Makura no Sōshi, for example, Sei Shōnagon only gives -dono to people of the rank of Dainagon or above, whereas -kimi is limited to those she knows well. Although she says:

女房の局なる人をさしの御許君などいへばめたらにうれし
と思ひて襲む事ぞいみじき

When one indicates a maid by saying ‘that omoto’, ‘kimi’ and the like, it is extraordinary praise and she will feel extremely happy.

The fact that -kimi could be used to flatter a servant shows how far it had degenerated.

At this point it should be noted that in some of the contexts mentioned above, it is perhaps somewhat inaccurate to describe -kimi as an “honorific” suffix. Particularly when added to personal names by means of the particle no, it might be more accurate to describe it as a “title”, rather than as an honorific in technical terms. In such cases -kimi seems to have had much the same meaning as the English titles “Lord”, “Prince” and suchlike, which while obviously respectful, function much more like names or titles than syntactic honorific markers. Be that as it may, this does not invalidate the remarks made earlier about the meanings and usages of -kimi and -dono.

In our discussion of MJ honorifics we mentioned the pronoun system, LOJ too had various pronouns which expressed the relationship between speaker and addressee. As the whole question of the role of pronouns in personal reference in LOJ is highly complex, however, we will leave further discussion of it until section 5.3.

5.2 Genji Character Reference

In order to study character reference in the Genji it was decided to take four of the most widely occurring and interacting characters and note the sobriquets which they are given over a set period of time in the novel. For this purpose Genji, Fujitsubo, Tō no Chūjō and Murasaki were chosen. It was decided to examine their

---

1 Morino (1971) p172
2 Quoted in Morino (1971)p171
appearances over the first ten chapters of the novel from *Kiritsubo* (桐壺), when Genji is born, to *Sakaki* (賢木) when Fujitsubo has become a nun and Genji is about to exile himself to Suma. The sobriquets given to each character and the number of times each is applied are listed in the tables below:¹

¹The information to construct the following tables was taken from Ikeda Kikan(ed) (1960) *Genji Monogatari Jiten* (Volume 2)
### 1. Sobriquets by Chapter for Genji and Fujitsubo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Title</th>
<th>Reference to Genji</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
<th>Reference to Fujitsubo</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiritsubo</td>
<td>wonoko miko tigo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sendai no shi no miya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kisaki no miya no Fimegimi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>miiko</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fujitsu no miya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wakamiya</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>kagayaku Fi no miya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fakenaki Fito miya</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>omoFu yau naran Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fito</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji no kimi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fikaru kimi genji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahakigi</td>
<td>Fikaru genji kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fito Fitori no Fonarisama</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maraudo</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chuujaau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utsusemi</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugao</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mikado no miko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka Murasaki</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fujitsu no miya miya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji no chuujaau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>wonna miya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fikaru genji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji no kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chuujaau no kimi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>noti no oya</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotokogimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Tsumu Hanayosi</td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Momiji no Ga</td>
<td>genji no chuujaau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Fujitsu no miya miya</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chuujaau no kimi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>kisaki</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>FaFamiya</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>kisakibara no miko</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotokogimi</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji no kimi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chuujaau</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>turenaki Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mikado no miko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>saishau no kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hana no En</td>
<td>saishau no chuujau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>kisaki</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>chuuguu</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji no kimi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fujitsu no watari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>kano watari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fujitsu no</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. *wonna miyas* is only present in some *Aobyashi* texts, others and *Kawachi-bon* texts have *miya* only. See Imazumi et al. (1976) p109.
1. Sobriquets by Chapter for Genji and Fujitsubo (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Title</th>
<th>Reference to Genji</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
<th>Reference to Fujitsubo</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aoi</td>
<td>taishau no kimi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>turenaki Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>kisaki no miya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taishaudono</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>chungu no kokoro</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tumuki Fito</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>tukusikikoyuru</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>turenaki Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotokogimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sakaki</td>
<td>taishau no kimi</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>chungu</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taishaudono</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>miya</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>turenaki Fito</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taishau</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>FaFamiya</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maraudo</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>udaishau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>genji</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Sobriquets by Chapter for Tō no Chūjō and Murasaki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter Title</th>
<th>Reference to Tō no Chūjō</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
<th>Reference to Murasaki</th>
<th>No. of Refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kiritsubo</td>
<td>kuraudo no shujuau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hahakigi</td>
<td>miyabara no chujuau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chujuau</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tou no kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utsusemi</td>
<td>chujuaudono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tou no chujuau</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chujuau</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tou no kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yugao</td>
<td>chujuaudono</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tou no chujuau</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>chujuau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tou no kimi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waka Murasaki</td>
<td>tou no chujuau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>wonnago ko</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wakagusa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hatugusa</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tigo</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kimi</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wakagimi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yukari</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>murasaki</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wosanaki Fito</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kusa no yukari</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As can be seen from the above tables, although the sobriquets varied quite considerably, there were some which were much more commonly applied to the characters than others. For both Genji and Murasaki the one most consistently applied, either on its own or with something else is *kimi* (君) which accounts for approximately 56% of Genji’s total and 50% of Murasaki’s. For Tō no Chūjō the most frequent sobriquet is *chuuja* (中將) accounting for 85% of all explicit references to him, while Fujitsubo has *miya* (宮) applied to her for 55% of her explicit references. The tables also show, however, particularly with reference to Genji, that there is a gradual change in the sobriquets applied to him. *Kimi* tends to be used more towards the beginning of the sample, while by the end *taishau* (大將) is being used more frequently, and *kimi* is much more restricted in its usage. This, no doubt,

1 Most texts have this, but some do have Fimegimi instead here (Imizuumi et al (1976) p155).
reflects Genji’s increase in rank as he gets older. Similarly, once Fujitsubo is promoted to Empress, she starts to be referred to with *kisaki* (後) and *chuuguu* (中宮) as well as *miya*. What though, could be the reason for the constant shifting of sobriquets within chapters? It might seem that these types of changes would make it extremely difficult to identify characters due to the lack of consistency of reference. On the other hand, if there were some kind of reason for the usage of particular sobriquets then it might go a considerable way towards explaining why so many different ones were used.

Before we proceed to examine this possibility though, it should be noted that there are two separate types of text in which characters can be referred to: first, straight narrative, when the author is describing events and actions; second, quotation, of either speech or thought, when characters are speaking to or thinking about each other. Obviously, there are differences in reference between these two types, particularly between quoted speech and narration, as the rank of the person doing the speaking would strongly influence the type of sobriquet used for reference. For example, in *Yugao* (夕顔), we have the following:

(2)  waraFabe no isogi -te ukon no kimi koso madu mono
child SUB hurry -T ukon no kimi P(EMPH) first thing

mi -tamaFe chujaudono koso kore yori watari -tamaFi
see -SH chujaudono P(EMPH) this from cross -SH

-nure to iFe -ba
-Q say -when

"...when a child hurried up and said, “Lady Ukon! Come and look straightaway. Lord Chūjō has gone past!”..."

This excerpt is taken from a speech by Koremitsu, when he is relating to Genji the results of his investigations at Yugao’s house. In his report of the child’s speech, the child refers to Tō no Chūjō with the highly honorific *chujaudono*, a sobriquet which he is given nowhere else in the sample. In narrative passages in this chapter either *tou*
no chuujau (頭中将), chuujau (中将) or, once only, tou no kimi (頭の君) are used.

Koremitsu himself, later in the passage following the excerpt uses tou no chuujau as a sobriquet, probably as he feels he does not have to display such a high level of respect as the child does.

Furthermore, one common designation for characters which has been largely omitted from our survey here is Fito (人), 'person'. This occurred in contexts such as:

(3)  mono no kokoro siri -tamaFito Fa kakaru Fito no
thing P heart know -SH person THE such person P

yo ni ide -oFasuru mono nari -keri to
world in appear -SH thing be -T Q

人々は、かいつもの世に出でおはするものなり
けりと。
People of sensitivity thought that such a person should appear in the
world...

or:

(4)  teiwa no kami naki kurai ni noboru -beki sau
emperor P above be not rank to rise -must physiognomy

oFasimasu Fito
(be-SH) person

...a person who has a physiognomy [that indicates that] he should rise to
a rank not above that of Emperor...

The first excerpt comes from a quotation of a character's speech or thought (it is unclear which due to the lack of a verb), and the second from quoted speech. Fito is very often used in quoted thought, often with an adjective or demonstrative to make the reference more specific, which is why there are sobriquets such as turenaki Fito, 'the person who [had been] cruel', used about Genji. Instances of Fito have only been listed above where they were specifically identified as referring to particular characters in the source consulted. It is to be supposed that other examples are not very numerous.

---

1 Imazumi et al (1976) p3
2 Imazumi et al (1976) p12
In order to attempt to discover if there was a system of some kind behind the variation in sobriquets used to refer to characters, it has been decided to look at character references in context in a single chapter and to see if there are any discernible common factors linking usages of particular sobriquets. For this purpose, the chapter Sakaki (篳木) has been chosen as all four of the characters studied appear in it and, particularly for Genji, there is a great deal of variation in the sobriquets used.

Sakaki is a chapter in which a great deal happens in the plot of the novel. It opens with the departure of the Lady Rokujo with her daughter, Akikonomu, for the Shrine at Ise, followed soon afterwards by the death of Genji’s father, the Kiritsubo Emperor. At this point Genji is living in domestic harmony with Murasaki who has reconciled herself to the thought of marriage to him. Nevertheless, Genji still yearns for Fujitsubo and manages to get in to see her, causing her a great deal of distress and apprehension lest gossip about the affair seep out and cause suspicion to be thrown on the parentage of her son the Crown Prince. In order to escape from Genji’s attentions she becomes a nun and surrenders her title of Empress in an attempt to placate Kokiden who, as mother of the Emperor, is in the ascendant. Genji also continues his affair with Kokiden’s younger sister, Oborozukiyo, but is eventually discovered in her rooms by her father, the Minister of the Right, after a storm. The chapter closes with Kokiden raging against Genji for this slight against her family and deciding that the time has come to act more forcefully against him.

In order to study character reference, it has been decided to take each use of a sobriquet to refer to Genji in its context and attempt to determine if there are any common linking factors between them. Other characters’ sobriquets will be mentioned when and if they appear in interaction with him. The first direct reference to Genji is as follows:

(5) taishau no kimi sasugani ima Fa to kakeFanare -tamaFi
     taishau no kimi indeed now THE Q separate -SH
     -nan mo kutiwosiu obosa -re -te
     P(EMPH) even be regrettable (think-SH) -SH -T
The Taishō no Kimi felt regret that they should finally part...

This excerpt comes towards the end of a passage that has described the Lady Rokujo’s emotions and her eventual decision to accompany Akikonomu to Ise. Explicit reference has been made to her, first with *miyasudokoro* and then with *wonnagimi*. Following this, Genji’s regret at her decision is introduced with *taishau no kimi*.

...as she went in such secrecy, the Taishōdon no did not know of it.

Here, the Lady Rokujo has been occasionally travelling back to her own palace from the shrine where Akikonomu is undergoing the preparatory rites for her departure to Ise. Genji has not had any news of these visits reported to him. As we know from other sources, the *-dono* suffix was a much stronger honorific than *-kimi*, so this would seem to be a fairly formal reference to Genji.

The man, even when he did not feel much, seemed to carry on using words of affection...
due to Genji’s sudden kindness. Several reasons could be advanced for reference to Genji using *wotoko* in this context: first, as the two characters have just exchanged poems, it could be an attempt to set a resonance with similar poetry exchanges in other works, for example the *Ise Monogatari*, where the protagonists are always referred to as *wotoko* and *wonna*. This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that Rokujiō has been referred to with *wonna* immediately prior to this excerpt. Alternatively, as the excerpt is part of an indirect quotation of Rokujiō’s train of thought, as Genji is the only man in her life, *wotoko* may be all that is required.

(8) taishaudono yori rei no tukise -nu kotodomo kikoe taishaudono from as usual P be exhausted -NEG things (say-OH)

-tamaFe -ri
-SH -T

大将殿より例のつきせぬ事ども聞え給へり。¹
The Taishodono had the usual inexhaustible number of things to say.

Akikonomu is undergoing a ceremonial lustration and this is the occasion for Genji’s communicating with her. As this is a formal court occasion, it is perhaps not surprising that he is referred to with the formal and respectful *taishaudono*.

(9) taishau Fa oFon arisama yuksi -te uti ni mo taishau THE SH- appearance want to know -T palace to P

mawira -mahosiu obose -do (go-OH) want (feel-SH) -but

大将は御有様ゆかして、内裏にも参らまぼしぐ思せど…²
The Taishō was eager to know what she looked like and wanted to go to the Palace, but...

We now shift from the formal and public domain of the lustration to a description of Genji’s own feelings: he wants to know what Akikonomu looks like and so wishes to go to her presentation at Court. Could it not be that the change of sobriquet is meant to indicate this change from a formal scene to a personal one?

(10) taishau no kimi ito aFare ni obosa -re -te taishau no kimi very moving P (think-SH) -SH -T

¹ Imaizumi et al (1976) p209
² Imaizumi et al (1976) p209
Rokujo and Akikonomu are on their way to Ise and, as their procession passes in front of his palace, Genji sends out a poem to Rokujo suggesting that she will be saddened by leaving him. This would seem to be an even more personal situation, relating as it does to Genji’s affair with Rokujo, and thus we have taishou no kimi used, as in the first excerpt.

These two excerpts can be taken together: the Kiritsubo Emperor, Genji’s father, has entered his final decline and is giving instructions to his various sons about what they must do after his death. The Emperor is told to rely on Genji for help and advice and Genji is told to support the Crown Prince. This is not a formal court affair, nor does it describe characters’ amorous emotions. In this way it seems similar to the previous usage of this sobriquet, where Genji’s feelings, but not of an amorous nature were described. Fujitsubo is present here, and is referred to with chuuguu, a formal title meaning ‘Empress’.

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p210
2 The poem is as follows: 聴きによくると今日行くとも絵巻半数の波にił他揺れじや (Furisuteku keFu Fa yaku to mo tsuzukakawasayatose no nani ni tode Fa naureji ya ) Soidensticker (1981) translates this as: “You throw me off; but will they not wet your sleeves/The eighty waves of the river Suzuka?” (p190)
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p211
4 Imaizumi et al (1976) p211
The Kiritsubo Emperor has died just prior to this excerpt, and consequently the Minister of the Right, as the current Emperor’s grandfather, is in political ascendancy. This is causing some concern to the nobles of the court, but Genji and Fujitsubo are not concerned with such things at present as they are preoccupied by the Kiritsubo Emperor’s funeral, which is mentioned immediately after this excerpt. This would, of course, have been a formal court function and so we have the formal titles taishaudono and chuuguu.

Genji has gone to the Kiritsubo Emperor’s palace on the occasion of Fujitsubo’s official departure for her own palace at Sanjō. This would be a formal situation and thus taishaudono is used to refer to his going there. Once there, Prince Hyōbukyō, who has come to collect Fujitsubo, Genji and the Lady-in-Waiting, Myōbu, all compose poems to express their sadness at the occasion. This is more personal and so taishau is used to refer to Genji. Similarly, Prince Hyōbukyō, who has been introduced with the formal Fyaubukyau no miya (兵部卿の宮) is referred to here with...
miko (新王), ‘prince’ alone. Myōbu, as she is of such a low rank, has a sobriquet, waumyaubu (王命婦) which although not strictly speaking a personal name, is used to refer to her alone in the text, and can perhaps thus be treated as a “name”.

The Taishōdono remained in gloomy seclusion.

Genji is in seclusion as a result of being in mourning for his father. This was a public requirement of the time, and so we have the formal taishaudo.

The reference to Genji here occurs within an indirect quotation of Kokiden’s thoughts. That may be the reason why taishau no kimi is modified by the demonstrative kono, ‘this’, possibly indicating that Genji is in the forefront of Kokiden’s thoughts and the primary object of her dislike. In any case, the usage of taishau no kimi for reference to Genji here fits the pattern that has been emerging. The ‘dead princess’ is Aoi, and the Minister of the Left was speaking to Genji about marriage, which can count as being personal and emotional.

The Taishō, no different from before, came to visit and...
This excerpt comes from the beginning of a passage describing how Genji, despite Aoi’s death, continues to visit his parents-in-law and concern himself with the details of his son’s upbringing. This might seem to be an emotional scene, but Genji’s concern seems to be more with his son’s servants and education, than with any feeling of affection for the boy and thus the neutral *taishau* is used.

(18) *taishau no kimi tosi tuki Fure -do naFo ofon-*

*taishau no kimi* years months pass *although further SH-

kokoro Fanare -tamaFo -zari -turu wo

heart be distant -SH -NEG -T CONJ

大将の着年月経れど、なお御心離れ給はざりつつるを…
The Taisho no Kimi, although months and years had passed, had not lost his interest [in Princess Asagao] and...

Again, the use of *taishau no kimi* fits the pattern; Genji’s emotional affairs are being described, in this case his continued interest in his cousin, Asagao, the only woman to successfully resist him.

(19) *Faragitanaki kataFe no wosiFe okosuru zo kasi*

*be spiteful relation SUB teach send word P(EMPH) P(EMPH)*

*to taishau Fa kiki -tamaFu*

Q *taishau THE hear -SH*

腹ぎたなきかへの、教へおこをするぞかし。大将傍聞き給ふ。
The Taisho heard that [a guardsman] had been sent to reveal the unpleasant affair.

Genji is a mere bystander in this situation. He has managed to arrange a meeting with Oborozukiyo, and is here lying with her while guards are chasing out lovers of some of the other ladies-in-waiting, the *Faragitanaki kataFe* of the excerpt. He is not concerned with this, and is only listening to what is going on, so we have the neutral *taishau*.

(20) *tada kono taishau no kimi wo zo yorodu ni tanomi*

*only this taishau no kimi OBJ P(EMPH) many P rely*

-kikoe -tamaFe -ru ni

-Oh -SH -T CONJ
This excerpt comes from within a long passage which starts with Genji thinking of Fujitsubo, and then moves on swiftly to describe her feelings for him. Of course, what she is relying upon Genji for is support in the material and political sense, especially as a supporter of her son, the Crown Prince, but this is definitely an emotional scene as immediately after the excerpt quoted we have a reference to the distress Genji’s continued unwelcome attentions are causing her, followed by her attempts to avoid him, and this leads directly into the excerpt below:

(21) wotoko Fa usi turasi to omoFi -kikoe -tamaFu man THE be painful be cruel Q feel -OH -SH
koto kagirinaki ni fact be limitless CONJ

The man felt in every way that she was cold and cruel,...

Genji has managed to get in to see her and spent the night. Wildly upset by her continued rejection of his attentions, he commits the ultimate Heian faux pas by refusing to leave at dawn. This seems to suggest that the usage of wotoko as a referent was reserved for occasions of the greatest emotion, and possibly, intimacy between two characters. The previous usage of wotoko, by Rokujō, agonizing over whether to continue a relationship with Genji, would seem to be a similar situation.

At this point it should be clear that there was a definite pattern to the usage of sobriquets to refer to characters, with the choice of sobriquet depending on the type of scene being described. For Genji it seems to be as follows:

3. Genji Sobriquets by Type of Scene

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sobriquet</th>
<th>Scene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taishō no kimi</td>
<td>&quot;Formal&quot; scenes, court occasions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taishō</td>
<td>&quot;Neutral&quot; scenes with little or no emotional involvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taishō no kimi</td>
<td>Personal, emotional scenes, connected with relationships with the opposite sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td>Extremely intimate and emotional scenes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Imaizumi et al (1976) p216
2. なおこの憎き御心のやまにを、ともすれば、御胸つぶし結びつ（maPo koro nikuhi oFondokoro no yaman ni, tomomureba, oFonnure wo tashinakita）Imaizumi et al (1976) lbid, p216. "That he had still not ceased his unpleasant affections, from time to time, crushed her heart..."
3. Imaizumi et al (1976) p216
This could perhaps be represented graphically as follows:

4. Graph of Genji Sobriquets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>taishau no kimi</th>
<th>taishau</th>
<th>taishaudono</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal</td>
<td>wotoko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same type of division, with some sobriquets used for formal scenes and others for personal ones, seems to hold true for other characters. In Sakaki, Fujitsubo is referred to with chuugu in formal situations and with miya in others. Murasaki is referred to with wonnagimi when Genji is thinking of her with the greatest affection, but with Fimegimi in other contexts. A further example comes from the chapter Aoi, when Genji finally sleeps with Murasaki for the first time.

Prior to this point, Murasaki has never been referred to with wonnagimi, so the sudden usage of the words for ‘man’ and ‘woman’ are a very strong indication of a change in the characters’ relationship, from one level of intimacy to another.

Of course, there are other reasons why some sobriquets are used, for example, there are two examples of wotoko being used to refer to characters when they are not recognised by others. In Suetsumuhana Genji comes across Tō no Chūjō unexpectedly, which is described as もとより男ありけり (motoyori tateru wotoko arikeri), "there was a man standing there already" and when the Minister of the Right finds Genji with Oborozukiyo in Sakaki, it is described as 添ひ臥したる男ありけり

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p199
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p126
(soFibusitaru wotoko mo ari)¹, “There was a man lying there as well”, with wotoko being used in these because the situation is being described from the point of view of Genji and the Minister of the Right, who do not recognise who they have met because in both cases their faces are hidden.

¹ Iimaizumi et al (1976) p235
5.3 Pronouns\(^1\) in Late Old Japanese

LOJ pronouns are listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ware, koko, maro, nanigasi, onore, ono, onora</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Person</strong></td>
<td>kimi, tono, omafe, na, nare, namuji, kimuji, soko, mauto, onore, ware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second Person</strong></td>
<td>kuyatu, suyatu, kayatu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As with MJ, LOJ had a number of personal pronouns, all of which, as well as conveying information about person (first, second and third), also encoded an amount of social information, in terms of respect or deference being shown to the person being addressed or referred to by the speaker. Some of them could be used for both first and second person reference, and others were derived from either honorific titles of some kind or demonstratives of location.

The social element of LOJ pronouns means that it is almost impossible to express their meanings simply in a language like English, whose pronouns do not carry such information. For example, the only possible English translation for maro, is “I”, but it should really be “I, used in informal, intimate situations”, and all the other pronouns encode similar sorts of information. To give an example of actual usage, in the Minori chapter of the Genji we have the following:

(23) Fito no kika -nu aFida ni maro ga Fabera -zama -n
person SUB hear -NEG time in I SUB (be-AH) -NEG -T
ni obosiide -nan ya to kikoe -tamaFe -ba ito
when (remember-SH) -T ? Q (say-OH) -SH -when very
koFisikari -nan maro Fa uti no uFe yori mo miya
dear -indeed I THE palace P lord than even princess
yori mo FaFa\(^3\) wo koso musari -te omoFi -kikoyure oFase
than even mother OBJ P(EMPH) excel -T think -OH (be-SH)

\(^1\) It is a matter of some linguistic debate as to whether the term "pronoun" can accurately be applied to Japanese, as the Japanese datimekhi (代名詞) class of words, which are usually referred to as "pronouns", exhibit some features which conflict with the traditional definition of a pronoun. For our purposes, however, this debate is largely irrelevant and so we will continue to refer to datimekhi as pronouns, although this may not be completely accurate in a technical sense.

\(^2\) Taken from Morino (1971) p178-80

\(^3\) There is a disagreement of interpretation here, with some commentators arguing that FaFa, "mother", should instead be baba, "old woman" and by association "grandmother". Murasaki is not, of course, Nino's mother, the nezy referred to in his speech is, but given Heian family customs which meant that he would have spent most of his time in Genji's house and not at the palace with his parents, "mother" in reference to Murasaki is thought to be possible here.
At a time when no one could hear, she asked, "When I'm gone will you remember me?"

"I really like you. I like my mother better than the Emperor or his Lady. If you're not here I feel really sad."

The conversation takes place here between Murasaki and Niou, who at this point is still only a child. Murasaki has been thinking of becoming a nun and wants to prepare the child for her possible "withdrawal from the world". The choice of pronoun here reinforces the informality of the situation and the intimate nature of the relationship between the two characters. Thus, a choice of pronoun could convey additional information about the situation and relationship between the people speaking or being described. It is, of course, impossible to know to what extent each particular pronoun was actually used in everyday speech between the court aristocrats. There is enough information available from various Heian texts, however, to allow us to work out more or less what each one meant and when it was appropriate, as has been shown by the example from the Genji given above. Meanings for all LOJ pronouns are given below:

1 Inouzumi et al. (1976) p851
6. LOJ Pronoun Meanings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Loj Pronoun Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ware, koko</td>
<td>Comparatively neutral first person reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nanigasi, onore, ono, onora</td>
<td>First person reference: used in situations requiring respect/deference. nanigasi restricted to male usage only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maro</td>
<td>First person reference: used in familiar, intimate situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kimi, tono, omaFe</td>
<td>Second person reference: used in situations requiring respect/deference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na, mare, namuji, kimuji, soko, mauto, onore, ware</td>
<td>Second person reference: used in familiar situations, or to assert superiority of speaker over addressee. onore, ware only used for second person reference at end of Heian period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuyatu, suyatu, kayatu</td>
<td>Third person reference: only rarely used.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In spite of this variety of different available choices, it seems pronouns were used relatively infrequently in LOJ. For example, if we consider the Genji, the total number of personal pronouns is as follows:

7. Personal Pronouns in the Genji

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>No. of Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>ware</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>maro</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nanigasi</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onore</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ono</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>onora</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>mauto</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nare</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kimuji(ra)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>suyatu(bara)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this figure may be slightly understated, as both koko and soko have been omitted from the count due to the confusion that could possibly arise over their dual roles, it is unlikely that their inclusion would swell the count by much and thus we are left with the fact that, as the Genji text we have been using consists of 1295 pages, it contains approximately one personal pronoun for every three pages of text, a very small number. It is often said that one of the reasons for the relative paucity of pronoun usage in MJ is the social information that its pronouns encode in that there is

---

1 Meanings taken from Morino (1971) p178-80
2 The figures to produce this table were obtained by counting the entries for each pronoun given in the index to the Genji. 池田敏雄 (1953) 漢籍物語
3 Some tests have onore here instead, so this may be the result of a miscopying.
no simple way to say “I” or “You” without expressing a great deal of unnecessary extra “baggage”. It seems quite possible that a similar situation may have been the case in LOJ.

Let us then examine some examples of personal pronoun usage from the *Genji* in order to see somewhat more clearly in what sort of situations particular pronouns were used, concentrating on the ones which were used most infrequently.

(24) saritomo surutubara wo Fitosinamini Fa si -Faber
in that case they OBJ be same rank THE do (be-AH)

nan ya waga kimi wo ba kisaki no kurai ni
P(EMPH) ? my lady OBJ THE empress P rank P

otosi -tatematura -ji mono wo ya tote
be inferior -OH -NEG person OBJ ? Q

'[...さりとも、すやつばらをひとしなみにのはし待りなんや。
我を君を後の位におとし奉らじものをや」と...]

"...If that's the case, would she be the same as them? As my lady, she
would not be inferior to the rank of an Empress, you know?" he said...

This is the only example of a third person pronoun being used in the entire *Genji* and it comes in a piece of speech from the Higo man, Tamakazura’s unwanted suitor, and not a court noble. The people to whom he is referring here are his other women, in not particularly complementary terms, it seems. He also seems anxious to emphasise that Tamakazura would enjoy a higher status than the rest. The Higo man is consistently presented as a coarse figure, who has pretensions to courtly graces, but is in fact incurably provincial, and it may be that his usage of a third person pronoun is simply another example of his lack of good manners.

If we turn our attention to second person pronouns, again we find relatively few examples. There are only two usages of *nare*, both in poems, for example:

(25) koFiwaburu Fito no katami to tenarase -ba
suffer for love person P keepsake P hand rear -when

nare yo nani tote naku ne naru -ran
you P(EMPH) what Q cry sound be -might

---

1 Imazumi et al (1976) p444
This poem is spoken by Kashiwagi to the cat which he has acquired from Jo San no Miya, Genji’s young wife, to serve as an object for his affections in place of her. The other poem\(^2\) is spoken by Yūgiri to Kumoinokari, his wife, and so in both cases the pronoun would seem to be indicative of a familiar and intimate relationship.

(26) ikani utukusiki kimi no oFbn- sarokokoro nari
P(EMPH) be wonderful lord P SH- sense of fun be

kinjira Fa onaji tosi nare -do iFukaFinaku
you THE same year be -although be useless

Fakanaka -meri nado Fome -te
be foolish -seem Q praise -T

「いかに、うつくしき君の御親心なり。きんじらは、同じ年なら
れど、言ふかひなくはかなかめり」などほどて...\(^3\)
“Well, so the proper Lord has a sense of fun. You’re the same age, but
seem foolish and useless.” He praised them and...

Here we have Koremitsu speaking to his children and the utukusiki kimi he refers to is Yūgiri, who has had Koremitsu’s son take a love note to his sister, Koremitsu’s daughter. The situation, inside a family, is obviously an intimate one, and Koremitsu, as the father, is in the superior position, and it is possibly significant that this conversation does take place between lower ranking characters. Possibly the use of a pronoun is intended to indicate a lack of breeding, as with the Higo man.

(27) aFare no koto ya kono ane -gimi ya
moving P thing P(EMPH) this sister -SH ?

mauto no noti no oya su nan Faberu to mausu
you P stepmother that P(EMPH) (be-AH) Q (say-OH)

「哀れの事や。此の апронや親人の後の親」。「きなん侍る」と
申す。\(^4\)
“What a pity. So his stepmother is your stepmother?”

---

1. Imaizumi et al (1976) p689
2. See Imaizumi et al (1976)p617
4. Imaizumi et al (1976) p41
"That is so," he said.

This brief exchange takes place between the young Genji and his retainer, Ki no Kami, while Genji is staying at the retainer’s house. The woman in question is Utsusemi, on whom Genji already has designs. The relationship here is clearly a lord-retainer one, and later on in the same passage Genji refers to Ki no Kami and his brothers as *mauto*\(\text{tati}\)*, reinforcing the point. On the other hand, it does seem that it could be used between near equals, as the only other examples of *mauto* in the text occur in a conversation between two servants\(^1\), both of whom have been taking love letters to Ukifune, one for Kaoru and one for Niou. This would not seem to be a situation where one is of noticeably higher status than the other, although one is a “guardsman”, *zuijin* (随身), and one a “messenger”, *tukai* (使), and it is the guardsman who uses *mauto*, possibly to subtly say that he feels he is in the superior position. As neither uses any honorifics with regard to the other’s actions, however, any difference in status cannot be great.

If we turn to consider first person pronouns, we find that they are much more numerous than the other two types, both in the number of different pronouns used, and the quantity of individual ones. We have already seen an example of the usage of *maro*, so we will not discuss it further here. Of the others, *ware*, the most frequently used, occurs in both speech and thought, even appearing in the novel’s second sentence:

\[
(28) \quad \text{Fajime yori ware Fa to omoFiagari -tamaFeru} \\
\text{beginning from I THE Q pride oneself -SH}
\]

\(\text{oFon- katagata SH- people}\)

possibly its frequency of occurrence is as a result of its “neutral” status. another relatively frequently occurring pronoun is *nanigasi*, almost as often as *maro*. One of

\[^1\text{Imaizumi et al (1976) p1187}\]

\[^2\text{Imaizumi et al (1976) p4}\]
the passages during which it occurs most often is during the “Dialogue on a Rainy Night” when the young Genji and some of his friends discuss the various types of women and their suitability for love affairs. In fact, 7.5% of the usages of nanigasi occur in 1.5% of the text, a fact which could be the result of chance, but possibly is because this is one of the few occasions in the novel when a group of characters sit around and refer fairly constantly to their own experiences or actions, as in:

(29) chuujau nanigasi Fa siremono no monogatari wo
chūjō I THE fool P story OBJ

se -n tote
do -T Q

To no Chujo said, “I’ll tell a fool’s story.”

nanigasi is required as a consequence of the presence of Genji whose rank is much higher than any of the others, even his friend, To no Chūjō.

If we turn to consider the occurrences of ono in the text then it seems that it may be categorised as expressing a relatively low degree of politeness. For example, it occurs in perhaps one of the Genji’s most famous passages, when Rokujō’s spirit speaks to Genji before she kills Yugao:

(30) oFon- makura garni ni ito wokasigenaru wonna
SH- pillow top by very beautiful woman

wi -te ono ga ito medetasi to
be -T I SUB very wonderful Q

mi tatematuru wo ba tadune mo obosa
see -OH OBJ THE visit even (think-SH)

de kaku kotonaru kotonaki Fito wo wi
-NEG such different useless person OBJ take

-oFasi -te tokimekasi -tamaFu koso ito mezamasiku
-SH -T love -SH P(EMPH) very outrageous

turakere tote
painful Q

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p33
An extremely beautiful woman was at his pillow, "I, who love you, you neither visit nor think of, and take this other useless woman and make love to her instead, it's outrageous and hurtful," she said and...

and furthermore, in a very different type of situation, when the young Murasaki comes weeping to her Grandmother because one of her playmates has let her sparrows escape:

(31) ama -gimi ide ana wosana ya iFukaFinaw mono nun -SH well P(EMPH) childish P(EMPH) useless thing

The nun [said], "Well, how childish! What a silly thing to be doing! My life might be over today or tomorrow, and you're not thinking about it at all, and worrying over sparrows!...

In the first excerpt, Genji is obviously someone who requires respect from the spirit as it uses the OH auxiliary *tatematuru* to modify its actions and the SH ones *oFasu* and *tamaFu*, as well as the SH verb *obosu*, with regard to Genji's. In the second, the nun, in spite of being her grandmother, expresses respect to Murasaki, possibly because she is a prince's daughter, using both *tamaFu* and *obosu*. Neither of these situations, between two lovers, and between family members in private would seem to require a high degree of politeness, or indeed deference. If we consider the remaining examples of *ono* in the text, we find that both are spoken by Prince Shikibukyō, the father of Higekuro's first wife and addressed to her. For example:

(32) *ono ga ara -n yo no kagiri Fa Fitaburuni*
Even though Shikibukyō uses honorifics with regard to his daughter’s actions, the fact that *ono* could be used in such a context, a father talking to his daughter must mean that the degree of politeness it expressed was not all that great. On the other hand, his other usage2 occurs in exactly the same phrase, *ono ga aran*, “while I am here”, and it is possible that this was a set phrase and thus required *ono*.

Finally, if we consider *onore*, we find that its usage was somewhat different, corresponding more closely to MJ *jibun*, “(o)ne self”, than to anything else. For example it could be used as follows:

(33) naki -tamaFu sama ito wokasige rautaku mi -tatematuru weep -SH appearance very beautiful moving see -OH

Fito mo ito kanasiku -te onore mo yoyo to person too very sad -T I too gradually Q

naki -nu
weep -T

...his weeping appearance was very beautiful and moving, and the person watching, was also very sad and himself too, gradually wept.

This is plainly not straightforward first person reference, as it occurs in the narrative and it is certainly not the narrator who is touched by Genji’s grief, but Koremitsu who is there with him, unlike the following:

(34) nanika sasi mo obosu ima Fu yo ni naki Fito what such even (think-SH) now THE world in be not person

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) pS75
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) pS69
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p77
Here it is Murasaki’s father, saying that he thinks she is spending too much time mourning her dead grandmother, and onore clearly applies to him.

We have now examined the usage of the majority of personal pronouns in the Genji, we have found that they are used extremely infrequently, possibly only where special emphasis is required, as in Koremitsu’s comparison of his children with Yūgiri and the Higo man’s comparison of his other women with Tamakazura. Others seem to be limited to particular contexts, such as poetry, and there is a clear link between the relative status of speaker and addressee and pronoun selection. The question which must now be addressed, however, is what mechanisms did the language use instead of personal pronouns, especially third person ones, given their extreme paucity, when it was necessary to refer back to people and identify them? This we will address in our next section.
5.3.1 Third Person Reference

Most languages, as well as possessing personal pronouns, have a set of words which can stand in for other sorts of nouns when it is necessary to refer back to something during a discourse. These are, of course, pronouns, although not personal ones. English, for example, has among others “this”, “that”, “these”, “those”, which are technically known as *demonstrative pronouns*.¹ There is a further group of words which modify the head-noun of a noun phrase in order to make the reference more specific. These are known as *determiners*, a sub-group of which is *demonstrative determiners*² which are, in English, identical to the demonstrative pronouns. Thus, for example, in the sentence:

\[(35) \text{This is my book.}\]

“This” is a pronoun, whereas in the sentence:

\[(36) \text{This book is mine.}\]

it is a determiner. There is also a group of words which fulfil a similar role for locations, in English “here” and “there”, which are technically considered to be *adverbs*³ but in the sentence:

\[(37) \text{My book is here.}\]

the word “here” is obviously standing in for some particular location, for example “on the table” or something similar.

LOJ possesses similar word categories, with a few differences. English “this” and “that” indicate proximity to, and distance from, the speaker respectively. LOJ, like MJ, has a three-way division instead, indicating proximity to the speaker, proximity to the addressee and distance from both, as follows:

---

³ Leech et al (1982) p50
8. Demonstratives in LOJ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronouns</th>
<th>kore</th>
<th>this</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sore</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kare</td>
<td>that (distant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determiners</td>
<td>kono</td>
<td>this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sono</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kano</td>
<td>that (distant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbs</td>
<td>konata</td>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sonata</td>
<td>there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kanata</td>
<td>over there</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that it was very common in LOJ to refer to high-ranking people by their location instead of by name or title, it was thought that it might be useful to see what sort of relationship, if any, there was between reference to people and the various LOJ demonstratives. In order to do this it was decided to examine all the occurrences of the above demonstratives and adverbs in a corpus of text and see what could be discovered. The corpus chosen was the Yūgao chapter.

9. Demonstratives in Yūgao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Person Reference</th>
<th>Non-Person Reference</th>
<th>Total in Chapter</th>
<th>Total in Text 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sono</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kano</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanata</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sore</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kare</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the data given above it would appear to be clear that it is the determiners which are most commonly used in reference to people, with kano being by far the most common in this usage. The adverbs seem not to be used at all, and rarely in the text as a whole anyway, and the pronouns occasionally. Let us examine some of these usages in order to see how these various words were used to refer to people and objects.

(38) oFon- zuijin tuiwi -te kano siroku sake -ru wo
    SH- bodyguard kneel -T that be white bloom -T OBJ

1 These figures were produced by counting the entries for each demonstrative in Ikeda (1953)
Here we have an example of *kano* simply being used to pick out something at some distance away from both speaker and addressee. Genji has gone to visit his wet nurse, Koremitsu’s mother, and is waiting in his carriage outside the gate while Koremitsu is looking for the key. He has been passing the time looking at the nearby houses and has seen the flowers growing on the gate of one of them. One of his guards has noticed his interest and come over to tell him about them. Obviously as the flowers are some way from both of them, the Guard chooses *kano*.

(39) Fito ni sira-re2-tamaFa-nu mamani kano person P know -T -SH -NEG in order that that yuFugaFo no sirube se -si zuijin bakari sateFa evening faces SUB inform do -T bodyguard only and then kaFo mugeni siru -majiki waraFa Fitori bakari zo face never know -NEG child one person only P(EMPH) wi-te-oFasi-keru take -T -SH -T

...so that no one would be able to know, he took with him only the guard who had informed him of the Evening Faces and one child whose face no one would know.

This is the first reference to the guard following his telling Genji the name of the flowers. The narrator seems to be using *kano* to give the identity of the guard some extra emphasis in the text, and to remind the reader that he has appeared before, although the relative clause performs this task as well. A similar usage appears in the following:

(40) kore koso kano Fito no sadame anaduri -si simo this P(EMPH) that person P judgement scorn -T lower
Genji is intrigued by the thought of Yūgao and is thinking back to the “Discussion on a Rainy Night”, which has occurred some two chapters previously. Kano Fito is Uma no Kami who had proposed the three grades of women and said that those of the lowest rank were not worth bothering about. As in the previous excerpt, kano seems to be being used to refer back to the character’s previous appearance in the text, even though it was some considerable time before; without it then there might be at least some confusion about the person’s identity, but with kano there the reader is ‘primed’ to expect that the character has appeared before somewhere and can take the other information given to identify the character precisely.

The above excerpt also contains an example of kore used to refer to a character, in this case Yūgao. This excerpt follows a conversation between Genji and Koremitsu when Koremitsu gives a report on his enquiries about the identity of the woman in the house with the Evening Faces growing outside. We are then told what Genji is thinking, which is the excerpt given. If the pronoun was not present, then the most obvious reading of the text would give:

[It] would be the lower rank scorned by that person in his judgement...

which is somewhat confusing. The pronoun, however, by its clear reference to the topic just under discussion, makes it clear that Genji is thinking about Yūgao here.

If we turn our attention to the other determiners, we find, as is shown above, that about half of their usages refer to characters in the text, and the other half do not, for example:

(41) oFoti no sama wo miwata
t road P appearance OBJ look over -SH -T while

Imizumi et al (1976) p67
Genji is sitting in his carriage in front of a particular house when he notices the new fence about the house next door. Obviously as this is a residential street there would have been a number of houses about and the narrator wants to make it clear to the reader that the new fence is around the house next to the one Genji is at, hence the choice of *kono* indicating closeness to Genji as the situation is being described from his point of view. The word here seems to be being used simply to give spatial reference more clarity. On the other hand, usage with regard to people seems to have a different purpose:

People could not hear and when [nobody] came, the woman shivered violently and was dazed, wondering what could be done.

Here Genji is attempting to awaken the servants he has brought with him to the empty house to which he has taken Yūgao. She is the woman shivering and confused.

Ukon, Yūgao’s lady-in-waiting, is in the room with them, but *kono* cannot be being used to distinguish her from her mistress because the honorific *won nagimi* can only

---

1. Imazumi et al (1976) p59
2. The original, *Figaki* (<i>Figaki</i>), describes a particular type of fence made of thin boards of *Mnoki* (<i>Japanese cypress</i>), placed diagonally and interwoven together, which was used to surround the houses of lower class people, i.e. not the nobility. Thus the use of *Figaki* makes it plain that this is not the kind of place that Genji would usually frequent.
3. Imazumi et al (1976) Ibid. p74
apply to Yugao. Consequently, it would seem that *kono* is being used for emphasis, to pick out Yugao in the text and emphasise the importance of what is happening here. Similarly, the most immediately previous reference to her in the text, where she is referred to as *kono o Fonkata Fara no Fito* (この御側の人), “this person at his side”, *kono* seems to be being used to emphasise the importance of what is happening here as Yugao is about to be attacked by Rokujō’s spirit.

Genji has managed to awaken his servants, has asked where Koremitsu is and been told that he has gone off for the evening. As previously, *kono* seems to have a mainly emphatic role. If it were omitted, it would still not be difficult to identify the character in question as this is adequately done by the relative clause, but *kono* adds a sense of immediacy to the actions being described.

If we turn our attention to uses of *sono*, then we find that it is used to refer to objects as follows:

If *son o* is used to refer to objects, it can also be translated as "that" or "the".

Koremitsu has just told Genji of the reaction of the women in Yugao’s house when a carriage that they believe to belong to To no Chūjō has gone past. On this occasion
sono seems to be used to modify karuma because the carriage is a part of Koremitsu’s experience and not Genji’s, and is thus “closer” to him.

On that person’s forty-ninth day, in the Hokado at Hie [Genji] had prayers read, with everything appropriate done in detail and not at all simply, beginning with the decorations. Even the decorations for the sutras and Buddhas were made with no lack of care. Koremitsu’s brother, the priest, a very famous man, performed second to none. [Genji] summoned a Doctor of Letters who had taught him and to whom he was close and had him write the Death Letter. [Genji] had already written a draft, writing of the desolate appearance of a person dearly loved, not [mentioning] the person’s name...

---

1. Yamazumi et al (1976) p88

2. A mountain near Heian-kyo, famous for its many Buddhist temples.

3. The two words in the original have slightly different meanings. Suzoku, are things attached to an object for the purpose of decoration. Kazari derives from a verb kazaru which includes the idea of tidying and cleaning up and then decorating to give a good impression if something is looked at from outside.

4. The original, asari, indicates a priest of a high enough rank to have taken on his own acolytes.

5. This was a document submitted as part of the offerings in Heian funerals, containing a plea for the Buddha to take care of the spirit of the deceased. In this case the prayer is to Amida (Amitabha).
In this excerpt kano is being used in the same way as has been described above, to refer back to someone who has appeared earlier in the text, in this case Yūgao. She was last mentioned some paragraphs before, during a conversation between Genji and Ukon, and the subject matter of the subsequent paragraphs has been Genji's relationships with other women. Yūgao is then re-introduced with kano, and we have a passage describing the memorial services that Genji has had commissioned in her memory, and continuing on to describe the arrangements he is making for the guwanmon to be written. We then get a reference to sono Fito, 'that person', but to whom is it referring? If kono refers to someone actually present in the events being described at the time, and kano is used to refer back to someone who has not been mentioned for a time, and re-introduce them, then logically sono should perform a role somewhere in between these two. A brief reading of the text suggests that this is indeed the case. Immediately prior to sono Fito the text has been discussing the guwanmon, and it seems that it is to this that the sono is referring. Let us remind ourselves of the grammatical structure of the original:

As can be seen from the above, sono and the reference to the guwanmon are in close proximity, and any Heian reader would have known that it would have been normal to actually give the identity of the person about whom a memorial prayer was written in it, so the usage of sono would seem to be anaphoric, but immediately so, referring to someone or something which has just been mentioned, rather than some time previously, as with kano. To give another example:

(46) nani Fito nara -n sono Fito to Fa kikoe mo
what person be -T that person Q THE rumour even

As can be seen from the above, sono and the reference to the guwanmon are in close proximity, and any Heian reader would have known that it would have been normal to actually give the identity of the person about whom a memorial prayer was written in it, so the usage of sono would seem to be anaphoric, but immediately so, referring to someone or something which has just been mentioned, rather than some time previously, as with kano. To give another example:

(46) nani Fito nara -n sono Fito to Fa kikoe mo
what person be -T that person Q THE rumour even

IImaiumi et al (1976) p88
Sono here clearly refers back to the nani Fito mentioned immediately previously.

Similarly we have the following example:

(47) mosi kano aFara ni wasure -zari -si Fito ni ya to if that moving P forget -NEG -T person P ? Q

obosiyoru mo ito sina -maFosi -ge -naru oFon-wonder P(EMPH) very know -want -NOM -be SH-

kesiki wo mi -te [............] wonna wo sasite appearance OBJ see -T woman OBJ particularly

sono Fito to tadunieide -tunaFa -ne -ba that person P identify -SH -NEG -as

[Genji] wondered if she could be the one that [To no Chujo] had sadly been unable to forget, seeing that he wanted very much to know more, [Koremitsu arranged a meeting between them]. As he had not definitely identified the woman as 'that person'...

In this case too, the use of sono seems to be referring back to a previous reference in the text, but here there is some distance between the two, instead of it referring back to something which was mentioned immediately before. The distance is not that great, however, and thus it seems possible to say the following about the roles of the three determiners:

10. LOJ Determiner Usages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kono</td>
<td>Used to give additional emphasis to characters already under discussion in a particular section of text by adding immediacy and closeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sono</td>
<td>Used to refer to characters previously mentioned in a section of text, either immediately previously or a relatively short time before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kano</td>
<td>Used to re-introduce characters into a section of text by referring back to a previous reference to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we turn our attention to the adverbs, we find, as has already been shown in Table 9, that they are considerably less numerous than the determiners, all three only appearing a total of five times in the chapter under consideration, and apparently not being used for personal reference at all. A survey of the text, however, reveals some

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) pp66-67
additional facts. It appears that kanata did not occur on its own. In all of its occurrences in Yugao (夕顔) it appears with konata, and this seems to be the case in other contexts as well. Thus, kanata is used as follows:

(48) konata kanata ketoFoku utomasiki ni Fito kowe
here there desolate and horrible P person voice

se -zu
do -NEG

...こなたかなた気違くょうとましきに、人こゑせず...¹
...everywhere was desolate and frightening, horrible and there were no voices to be heard.

The compound word konatakanata seems to indicate ‘places near and far’, ‘all around’, as it is used above. A consideration of some of its occurrences outside of the chapter in consideration reveals that it could be used for personal reference as in:

(49) konata kanata kokoro wo aFase -te Fasitaname waduraFa
here there heart OBJ join -T shame suffer

-se -tamaFu toki mo oFokari
-CAUSE -SH time too be many

...こなたかなた心をあはせて、はしたなめ煩はせ給ふ時も多か り。²
...and there were many times too that all [the women], joining their hearts together, shamed her and made her suffer.

In this excerpt it seems clear that konatakanata is being used to refer to the other women at court, who hate Kiritsubo for her place in the Emperor's affections. It is not, however, referring to a particular person, but to a group of people in a general way, and context supplies the more specific identity of the women. Similarly, we have:

(50) sono noti konata kanata yori Fumi nado yari -tamaFu -besi
that after here there from letter etc send -SH -must

その後、こなたかなたより、文などやり給ふべし。³
After that, everyone must have sent letters.

¹Imaizumi et al (1976) p76
²Imaizumi et al (1976) p2
³Imaizumi et al (1976) p127
The context here is that Genji has managed to get in and see Suetsumuhana, and as a consequence the other young nobles of the court have decided that she must be worth looking at if Genji thinks her worthwhile. Consequently, they send her letters, which she ignores and sends no replies. In this excerpt it would be possible to interpret the original as meaning:

After that, letters must have been sent from everywhere.

Considering, however, that *konatakanata* is used to modify references to characters quite often as follows:

(51)  
konata kanata no Fitobito nado no  
here there P people etc P

ここたかなたの人々なども...¹
All the people as well...

(52)  
konata kanata no oFon- okuri no Fito -domo  
here there P SH- send P person -PLURAL

ここたかなたの御送の人ども...²
All the attendants...

It would not be beyond the bounds of possibility to interpret it as referring to the people sending the letters, as opposed to the locations from which they come. In any case, *konatakanata*, whether used to modify a personal reference or not, clearly gives a sense of generality, either of location, or of a group of people.

On the other hand, if we consider *konata*, which does occur on its own, we find that it is used to refer to specific places as in:

(53)  
tati -nagara konata ni iri -tamaFe to  
stand -while here in enter -SH Q

「立ちながらこたなに入り給へ」と...³
"Stand up and come in here," said [Genji]...

(54)  
Fito sumu -beka -mere -do konata Fa Fanare -tari  
person live -should -seem -but here THE be far -T

住宅むべかあれど、こたなは離れたり。⁴

¹ Imaizumi et al (1976) p.157
² Imaizumi et al (1976) p.188
³ Imaizumi et al (1976) p.79
⁴ Imaizumi et al (1976) p.72
Although it seemed that people should live [there], here was far [from everywhere].

The translation is somewhat awkward, but konata clearly refers to the place where Genji has taken Yūgao, and where they are portrayed as being in the narrative. Thus, konata either refers to locations where the speaker is, as in the first excerpt, or to places where the characters being described in the narrative are, and this seems to be its use in the vast majority of cases. It does seem though that it was occasionally used as a pronoun, for example:

(55) ono ga ara -n konata Fa ito Fito waraFe -naru
    I SUB be -T you THE very person laugh -be

sama ni sitagaFi nabika -de
appearance P follow drift along -NEG

「...おのがあらんこなたは、と笑へなる様に隨ひ癖かで...」
“...while I am alive you will not wander along as an object of people's laughter...”

Here we have Prince Shikibukyō talking to his daughter, Higekuro’s wife, after her husband has married Tamakazura. In this particular context there is obviously a need for some fairly explicit personal reference in order to identify exactly about whom the Prince is talking. If the konata Fa were not present then it would be possible to interpret the text as meaning:

“...while I am alive I will not wander along as an object of people's laughter...”

but the presence of konata makes it plain that he is referring to his daughter here, and not himself. This type of usage, however, seems to be exceptional, with konata simply being used to indicate location by far the most common.

Finally, if we turn our attention to sonata, we find that it has the smallest number of occurrences of all the adverbs, as has been shown in Table 9. Although it does not occur at all in the chapter under consideration, a brief survey of some other excerpts reveals that it is used to indicate location as follows:

(56) to Fanati -turu waraFa mo sonata ni iri -te Fusi
door open -T child too there in enter -T lie down

---

1 Imaizumi et al (1976) p569
Here we have described the scene at the house of Ki no Kami. Genji, in the company of Kogimi, has come to the house in secret in the hopes of once more meeting with Utsusemi. Once again, the scene is being described from Genji’s point of view and he is watching as Kogimi opens the door and goes in and lies down. Consequently, *sonata* is used as the boy’s location is at some distance from Genji, but, of course, close to himself. It also appears to be possible to use *sonata* in a figurative sense, as in:

(57) \begin{align*}
&\text{sonata ni -te mire -ba midare ureFuru koto ya}\nonumber \\
&\text{there be -T see -if confusion grief fact P(EMPH)}
\end{align*}

\[\text{ara -n}\]
\[\text{be -T}\]

‘...if that should happen, there would be confusion and grief...’

Here we have the Physiognomist describing the results should Genji become Emperor. He is obviously not talking about a physical location but a particular event. Possibly *sonata* is used here to imply a certain distance between the present and the event to which the Physiognomist is referring. Similarly, we have the following:

(58) \begin{align*}
&\text{imijiu adamei -taru kokoro sama ni -te sonata}\nonumber \\
&\text{extremely amorous -T heart appearance be -T there}
\end{align*}

\[\text{ni Fa omokara -nu aru wo}\]
\[\text{P THE serious -NEG be CONJ}\]

‘...いみじうあたへいたる心様にて、そなたには重からぬあるを...’

‘...she was of an extremely amorous bent, and was not particular about it, and...’

---

1. Imaizumi et al. (1976) p.54
2. Imaizumi et al. (1976) p.12
3. Imaizumi et al. (1976) p.157
This excerpt is part of the description of the Naishi no Suke with whom Genji carries on an affair before being surprised by Tō no Chūjō pretending to be one of her other lovers. Here, *sonata* is referring back to Naishi’s *adameitaru kokoro sama*, which is not a location but a facet of her character. Thus it seems that *sonata* could be used for a range of anaphoric reference, not being limited to referring to locations. It does not seem, however, that it was used for personal reference, although there is one example:

```
(59) midarikokoti nomi ugoki -te -nan kikoesse -n
confused feelings only move -T -P(EMPH) (say-OH) -T
mo nakanakani -Faberu -bekere -ba sonata ni mo
even thoughtless -AH -should -as ? to even
mawiri -Fabera -nu
(go-OH) -AH -NEG
```

「...乱り心地のみ動きてなん、聞えさせんもなかなかに待るべけば、そなたにも参り待らぬ」
"...I am completely sunk in grief, if I were to so much as speak to you, I would be out of control, so I will not come to you."

This excerpt is part of a letter that Genji has written to Aoi’s mother, Omiya, explaining that he will not come in person to take his leave of her. *Sonata* in the above text can be interpreted as referring to Omiya herself, but given that it was common in LOJ to refer to high-status women by their locations, instead of directly, it could equally well be referring to the place where she is, meaning that it is simply being used to refer to a location as normal and is not, strictly speaking, being used for personal reference.

We are now in a position to say the following about the usage of the adverbs:

---

1 Izumi et al (1976) p195
11. LOJ Adverb Usages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adverb</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>konata</td>
<td>Used to indicate a location, the place where the speaker is. Occasional usage as 2nd person pronoun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sonata</td>
<td>Mainly used to indicate a location, a place at some distance from the speaker/writer. Could also be used figuratively for anaphoric reference, but does not seem to have been commonly used for personal reference.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kanata</td>
<td>Not used at all in isolation, only as part of compound word konatakanata, indicating 'everywhere'. Could be used for personal reference, not particular people, but groups, and to give sense of generality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally let us turn our attention to the three demonstrative pronouns, kore, sore and kare. In the chapter under consideration, there is only one example of kare as follows:

(60) namotauraidausi1 to zo wogamu naru kare kiki -tamaFe
    prayer Q P(EMPH) pray be that listen -SH

「南無當来導師」とぞ拝むる。「かれ聞き給へ...」

"Namu Tōraiōshi," he prayed. "Listen to that!" [said Genji]...

which seems to be a straightforward example of it being used in its normal sense.

There are some examples, however, of it being used to refer to people in conjunction with another pronoun. For example:

(61) sore ka kare ka nado toFu naka ni
    that ? that ? Q ask in P

「それが、かれか」など間ふ中に...

[To no Chūjō] asked [Genji], "Is it her ? Or her ?"

(62) ito asiki koto nari to kore kare kikoyu
    very bad thing be Q this that (say-OH)

「いと悪しき事なり」と、これかれ聞ゆ。4

"It would be a very bad thing," said everyone.

The first excerpt occurs at the beginning of Hahakigi (帯木) when Tō no Chūjō has gone into Genji's room at the palace and started reading the love-letters Genji has

---

1 Miroku Irosata, a particular Buddhist deity, said to save mankind.
2 Imaizumi et al (1976) p70
3 Imaizumi et al (1976) p20
4 Imaizumi et al (1976) p59
received from various women about the court. His question to Genji is an attempt to
guess the identity of the senders. The second excerpt comes from later in the same
chapter, when Genji is proposing not to leave his wife’s house, even though it would
be taboo to remain. The statement is made by the various serving women around the
house. In both of these cases, the pronouns are not being used to refer to a specific
person, Tō no Chūjō’s question must be assumed to be repeated a number of times
and in the second case we have a group of servants. In fact, korekare seems to be
being used in exactly the same manner as konatakanata was used, to give a sense of
generality. There is, however, one case where the pronouns are used to refer to
specific people.

This passage comes from Kiritsubo (桐壇) and is a comparison of Fujitsubo and
Kiritsubo and we have the pronouns used to refer to the two women in question.
Fujitsubo has just been being discussed prior to this excerpt so the use of kore is
explained by the fact that she is the topic under discussion. Kare is then used to
contrast with kore, as Kiritsubo, being dead and in the past, is figuratively more

\[\text{(63) kore Fa Fito no oFon- kiFa masari -te omoFinasi}
\]
\[\text{medetaku Fito mo e- otosime -kikoe -tamaFa -ne -ba}
\]
\[\text{ukebari -te akanu koto nasi kare Fa Fito}
\]
\[\text{no yurusi -kikoe -zari -si ni oFon- kokorozasi no}
\]
\[\text{ayanikunari -si zo kasi}
\]

This [lady] was a person of high rank and, being quite wonderful, no
one could despise her, so [the Emperor] could dote on her to his heart’s
content. With the other, people had not allowed it and his favour had
been inconvenient.

\[\text{1 Imazumi et al (1976) p13}\]

distant than Fujitsubo. The pronouns, however, are not being used in the same way as personal pronouns in English. As the narrator is making a contrast between the two women, something is needed to identify the beginning of the two contrasting statements, if either were not present then it would probably not have been necessary to have the pronouns present.

If we turn our attention to *kore*, we find that, as mentioned in Table 9, there are three occasions in the chapter where *kore* is used for personal reference:

(64)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kore</th>
<th>koso</th>
<th>kano</th>
<th>Fito</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>sadame</th>
<th>anaduri</th>
<th>-si</th>
<th>simo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>P(EMPH)</td>
<td>that</td>
<td>person</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>judgement</td>
<td>scorn</td>
<td>-T</td>
<td>lower</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

no sina nara me  
P grade be -T

これこそかの人の定め傷りし下の品ならめ...¹
This [woman] would be of the lower rank scorned by that person in his judgement...

(65)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ukon</th>
<th>wo</th>
<th>okosi</th>
<th>-tamaFu</th>
<th>kore</th>
<th>mo osorosi</th>
<th>to omoFi</th>
<th>-taru</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukon</td>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td>awaken</td>
<td>-SH</td>
<td>this too</td>
<td>be afraid</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

sama ni -te | mawiri | -yore | -ri  
appearance be | -T | (come-OH) | gather | -T |

[Genji] woke Ukon. She too appeared to think it frightening and clung to him.

(66)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kore</th>
<th>mo aFare</th>
<th>wasure</th>
<th>-tamaFa</th>
<th>-zu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>this</td>
<td>too moving</td>
<td>forget</td>
<td>-SH</td>
<td>-NEG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...星も哀れ忘れ給はず。³
...[Genji] had not forgotten her either.

In each case the structure is similar, *kore* is used to refer back to a person mentioned previously by the narrator. In the first case, Yūgao; in the second, Ukon; and in the third, Utsusemi. Ukon is mentioned in the sentence before, Utsusemi has just sent Genji a letter and poem, and Koremitsu has just concluded his report on his observations of Yūgao's house. As has been mentioned before, in the first excerpt, *kore* is necessary in order to make it plain that Genji is thinking about a person here,

¹ Imaizumi et al (1976) p67
² Imaizumi et al (1976) p74
³ Imaizumi et al (1976) p87
but in the latter two excerpts the pronoun seems to be being used more to give an extra emphasis to the statements, as in both cases if the pronoun was absent, it would still be possible to identify the referent from contextual and other factors.

Finally, if we turn to consider *sore*, we find that there are three occasions in the chapter where it is used to refer to people. First, let us consider the following:

(67) womna Fa ika ni to notamaFe -ba sore nan mata
woman THE what P Q (say-SH) -when that P(EMPH) still

e- iku -majiu -Faberu -meru
NEG- live -NEG -AH -seem

「...女のいかに」と言へば、「それなん又え生くまじう待める...」
"What of the...woman ?" said [Genji],
"She does not seem to want to live..."

This occurs in direct speech and it would seem that Koremitsu uses *sore* for emphasis here. It is followed by the emphatic particle *nan*, which required something to emphasise. If neither pronoun nor particle were present, it would still be possible to identify the person about whom he was talking from the context, so the pronoun cannot be present for this purpose. Possibly, as he is talking about something so serious, Ukon's suicidal feelings, Koremitsu feels that extra emphasis is required. He probably chooses *sore* as opposed to *kore* because Ukon is not actually in the room with them at the time, and he is establishing a sense of distance between her and Genji and himself.

The other two examples of *sore* used for personal reference in the chapter occur in the first exchange of poetry between Genji and Yūgao, and in both cases the usage is similar:

(68) kokoroate ni sore ka to zo miru siro tuyu no
guess P that ? Q P(EMPH) see white dew P

Fikari soFe -taru yuFugaFo no Fana
light compare -T evening faces P flower

心あてにそれかとぞ見る白露の光添へたる夕顔の花

---

^Imauizumi et al (1976) p60
^Imauizumi et al (1976) p61
As a guess
Do I see that?
White dew's
Light compare
Evening Faces flower

I guess
Is it you I see?
Who rival the glistening
White dew on
The Evening Faces flower

Come closer
You will see that
In the evening
Faintly seen
Flower of the evening faces

The usage of sore in the second poem clearly is in response to the usage in the first, where sore ka, literally "[Is it] that?" stands in for sono Fito ka, "[Is it] that person?", in other words, "Is it Genji?". The choice of pronoun here, however, is probably largely determined by the requirements of the poetry and the need for the appropriate number of syllables, and so it is difficult to extrapolate any generalities about usages of sore from these cases.

If we consider what we have discovered so far with regard to the pronouns, then we have the following:

---

1Imaiumi et al (1976) p62
12. LOJ Demonstrative Pronoun Usages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demonstrative</th>
<th>Usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kore</td>
<td>Used for personal reference for emphatic purposes, to refer to someone currently under discussion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sore</td>
<td>Used for personal reference for emphatic purposes, to refer to someone under discussion but not present with characters talking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kare</td>
<td>Used for contrastive personal reference in conjunction with other pronouns to refer to someone more distant than a person referred to with the other pronouns. Also in compound word korekare, meaning “everyone”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From our studies of the demonstratives it seems we can say that they are used in LOJ for personal reference, either in an emphatic sense, or to re-introduce characters mentioned previously. Following a re-introduction, however, they do not continue to be used and the text reverts to straightforward zero reference.

5.4 Conclusion

Our studies of personal reference in LOJ have revealed that the constant shifting of sobriquets used to refer to the characters in the text was, in fact, highly context-dependent, with appropriate sobriquets being chosen according to the type of scene being described at the time. Consequently, it is difficult to consider the characters' lack of invariable personal names as adding to the text's vagueness. In fact, the constant shifts could be seen as helping to make the text's meaning more clear by making it more apparent exactly what sort of scene is being described at any particular point. In pragmatic terms, Murasaki Shikibu is definitely being cooperative.

Our studies of LOJ personal pronoun usage have revealed that, as in the modern language, LOJ pronouns carried additional information about the relationship between people as well as simple information about person, in other words that social deictic factors were involved in their usage. This fact may account for the fact that they are used extremely sparingly in the text, tending to be used only when the author
wants to emphasise the relationship between characters, rather than as a simple means of identification as would be the case in an English language text.

As well as personal pronouns, however, it was also possible to use demonstrative determiners, pronouns and adverbs to refer to characters when it was necessary to identify characters clearly, or refer to them anaphorically. It is also true to say, however, that these demonstratives were used for emphatic purposes to pick out particular episodes in the text, when they were not absolutely necessary for identification purposes. Consequently, our studies of personal reference have reinforced what we have discovered elsewhere, that in LOJ both syntactic and pragmatic factors operated to prevent vagueness from occurring.
Chapter Six

Conclusion

6.0 Overview of the Previous Chapters

In Section 1.9 we considered various different avenues that might be pursued in order to answer our central question of whether or not LOJ could be defined as a particularly vague language. Let us now review what our studies have revealed up to this point.

First, we studied the system of honorific language used in LOJ. An analysis of a section of text clearly demonstrated that in most contexts honorifics alone could provide an identification of characters in the *Genji* text, rendering the inclusion of many explicit subjects unnecessary. It was not the case, though, that characters could be identified solely on the basis of the honorifics applied to them throughout the entire text. Very high ranking characters, most noticeably the Emperor, could often be clearly identified by the honorific forms applied to them alone, and there was a tendency to use certain honorific forms consistently over relatively short expanses of text to single out and identify a particular character, Fujitsubo in the example studied. In situations where two or more characters of similar ranks are involved in the action of the scene, however, analysis showed that explicit subjects, and certain syntactic features indicating a change of subject would be included in order to make it as clear as necessary which character was performing which actions. A link was also established between a character’s social status in the court and the likelihood of their being given implicit subject reference. Furthermore, the more frequent a character’s appearances in the text, the more likely they were to be given implicit subject reference.

Second, we examined the phenomenon of Switch Reference (SR) in LOJ. An analysis of a passage of text led to the conclusion that canonical SR does not exist in LOJ due to the large number of apparently aberrant cases of SR marking. If a more liberal concept of the phenomenon is used, however, then some form of SR does
seem to exist in LOJ. This type of SR system, however, would be of only limited use in the elimination of vagueness, as it does not conclusively indicate same or disjoint subject reference.

Third, a study was made of the syntactic features used to separate quotation from narration in LOJ. This discovered that the ends of quotations were almost always clearly marked, either with a particle and verb combination or with a particle alone. The beginnings of quotations were less clearly marked, with context seeming to play a large part in enabling readers to identify exactly when a quotation began. There were occasional instances of quotations following each other directly, without any marking, but as these usually took the form of a question and answer, or a statement and comment about it, it was possible in these instances to determine who was making which statements. There were, however, cases where various modern editors of Genji texts took different positions on exactly when some quoted speeches began. An analysis of some of these instances, though, showed that it was possible to form a firm opinion as to which of these versions were correct. A further aid to separating quotation from narration was that there were indications that the distribution of some tense and aspect markers was different in quotations from that in narration.

Finally, we addressed the question of personal reference in the Genji. Much has been made of the fact that few characters possess personal names, instead being referred to with “a series of shifting sobriquets”.¹ A study of the sobriquets used to refer to several characters over the novel’s earlier chapters revealed a link between the sobriquet used and the type of situation being described, with formal titles being used in formal situations and minimal sobriquets in highly charged emotional ones. Furthermore, a study was made of personal pronoun usage in the text which found that they are used very infrequently and only in particular contexts, and established a link between status and pronoun selection. A study of LOJ demonstratives found that

---

¹Seidensticker (1981) pxi
they can be used for personal reference, either for emphatic purposes, or to re-introduce characters previously mentioned to the text.

6.1 Conclusions

Considering the results achieved from Chapters 2-5, it is possible to say that when one considers the way in which the *Genji* text is structured, there can be no justification for referring to LOJ as a language that is in any way more innately vague than any other of the world's languages. In all languages there is a balance between the information conveyed by its syntax and the information which is expected to be derived from pragmatic factors, and while it is true to say that LOJ was a language in which context played a large part in the derivation of meaning from a text, this does not make it vague. Indeed, all our results suggest that Murasaki Shikibu was being co-operative when she wrote and included as much information in her text as she considered necessary, and sometimes more than enough to ensure that her readers understood her text. Thus, the *Genji Monogatari* is not and never has been a "loose sequence of vague phrases".  

6.2 Areas for Further Study

In a work of this scope it is only possible to examine some of the areas which have a bearing upon this topic, and there are several approaches which would bear further detailed investigation. A major field as yet unstudied would be to expand the study beyond the *Genji Monogatari* to investigate the language used in other LOJ works in order to determine whether the language used in the *Genji* differs from that used in works dealing with different subject matter. It may have been the case that Murasaki Shikibu felt that she could use the language she did because the *Genji* deals mainly with interpersonal relationships and characters spend most of their time in conversation with each other and only rarely actually do anything. It would, therefore, be useful to examine texts with other types of subject matter, such as diaries.

---

1 Morris, Ivan (1964) *The World of the Shining Prince: Court Life in Ancient Japan* Penguin, p.292
and other tales, to see if there are any noticeable differences from the results achieved in our study of the *Genji*. Such a study could lead on to examinations of works from later periods to trace the way in which the language changed and developed after the LOJ period.

Another avenue which could usefully be pursued would be a comparison of the original text with some of its modern Japanese translations in order to determine under which circumstances the translators have found it necessary to be more specific than the original, and then to see what the original uses instead. Unfortunately, this comes across the problem of the type of translation the authors intended to create, and the type of audience they expected to read their work. For example, an academic writing a translation so that students can check it against the original if there are parts they do not understand, will write a different type of translation from a novelist trying to reproduce the beauty of Murasaki's language in MJ. Work has also been done which indicates that the style of *Genji* translations is different depending upon the period in which they were written, possibly as a result of influence from Western languages.\(^1\) Of course, this also raises the question of exactly what sort of audience Murasaki Shikibu intended for the *Genji*. Unfortunately, this is a topic on which we can only speculate. Obviously, it was intended for some proportion of the court nobility in Heian-Kyō, but whether this was just the immediate court circle, or a somewhat wider group, is impossible to say. This does have a bearing on the question of vagueness, as if she intended it only for the immediate circle of the court, then she may have felt more at liberty to leave things implicit which the inhabitants of the palace would have known about.

As a corollary to an examination of some MJ translations, it might be possible to examine the two English ones, by Waley and Seidensticker, to see whether there are any cases where the translators have gone beyond translation and left obscure things which a reader of the original would be able to understand from the context, or if there are cases where things have been excessively clarified.
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