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In example sentences, abbreviations are used to indicate the meaning of grammatical functions. All the abbreviations and their meanings are shown below.

CONF—confirmation seeking particle
COP—copula
GER—gerund
NOM—nominal
OBJ—object marker particle
PRENOM—prenominal
SUBJ—subject marker particle
TOP—topic marker particle
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

1. 1 Problem

Learners of the Japanese language often use the adjectival, hosii1 'desirous' inappropriately. The following question is one example of misuse which occurs when a Japanese language learner wants to ask his professor if she2 wants to have a copy of an article.

(1)# Sensee, kono kopii hosii desu ka?

professor this copy desire COP-DISTAL

QUESTION

1 I will use the romanization used in Japanese: the Spoken Language (Jorden and Noda 1987-1989).
2 In this thesis I will use 'he' for the speaker and 'she' for the hearer.
3 Grammatical function is written in capitalized alphabet in the glosses. COP stands for COPULA.
4 Terms used are those used in Japanese: The Spoken Language (Jorden and Noda 1987-1989). Distal is the speech-style which indicates that 'the speaker is showing solicitude toward, and maintaining some linguistic distance from, the addressee, i.e., s/he is being less direct and more formal as a sign of deference to the person addressed (and/or the topic of discussion), rather than talking directly, intimately familiarly, abruptly, or carelessly' (Jorden and Noda 1987: 32).
The reason why the learner formulates this sentence is that he simply translates either of the following English sentences into Japanese.

(2a) Do you want to have this copy?
(2b) Would you like to have this copy?

These English examples are appropriate in the same situation and do not make the hearer uncomfortable whereas the Japanese example sounds rude or offensive. Minor differences are observable between the two English translations with (2b) being a little more formal than (2a). However, these differences are subtle in the English language and especially when a learner of Japanese tries to actively translate his English thoughts into Japanese sentences. Either example, (2a) or (2b), leads to the use of hosii. The unacceptability of this Japanese example lies in the misuse of hosii. However, the following example, which occurs when the speaker asks his friend if she wants to have a copy of an article, is acceptable.

(3) Kono kopii, hosii?
    this copy desire-DIRECT
    'Do you want to have this copy?'

The fundamental difference between example (1) and (3) is the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. The difference

5 "Direct-style contrasts with distal-style" (Jorden and Noda 1987: 32).
of the relationship between the speaker and the hearer is reflected in speech-style: (1) is "distal", and (3) is "direct" (Jorden and Noda 1981: 164-166). According to Jorden and Noda, speech-style in Japanese language is different according to relationship between the speaker and the hearer. Distal-style reflects the psychological distance between the speaker and the hearer whereas direct-style reflects just the opposite. In example (3), the intimacy of the speaker and the hearer is reflected in direct-style. On the other hand, (1) shows the distance perceived by the speaker between the speaker and the hearer, the professor and his student, in distal-style. Only the stylistic difference between these two questions make them different, in other words, the use of はosi as the main predicate in a question acceptable in the situation that calls for the use of direct-style, while it is unacceptable in a situation that requires distal-style.

My investigation started with the following questions: 1) why do Japanese language learners often misuse はosi as in example (1), and 2) why is はosi acceptable as the final predicate in the question directed to intimate hearer in particular situation whereas it is unacceptable in the question directed to distanced hearer in the same situation? In this thesis I will answer these questions and suggest a pedagogical application of my findings.
Existing explanations of the usage of kosei will be examined in Chapter II. These explanations are categorized into two types according to their definition of zibun ('self'): one definition assumes an absolute self-identification in the Japanese human relationship, and the other assumes a relative self-identification in the Japanese human relationship.

In Chapter III, I will develop a working model of the the usage of kosei, which will satisfy the shortcomings of the existing explanations. First, I will state the environment in which kosei is used in modern spoken Japanese and then present my hypothesis based on my observations. Having stated my hypothesis, I will present Lehra’s observation of Japanese social behavior to support my hypothesis. I will utilize her scheme to explain the usage of kosei because Japanese social behavior tightly relates to language use.

In Chapter IV, I will apply my findings to the pedagogical domain. I will suggest an appropriate environment for introducing kosei in the Japanese language course and present a possible method for teaching kosei by applying my findings.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF PREVIOUS LITERATURE

2.1. Introduction

Morita (1980: 427-429) notes that *hosii* expresses the feeling of *zibun no te ni ireta* ('Lit. want to get the object in one's hand') or *zibun no mono ni sita* ('Lit. want to make it one's belongings'). A similar explanation to Morita's is also provided in *Kojien* (1963: 2034). The crucial point of explaining the usage of *hosii* is the definition of *zibun* ('self'). In the following sections I will provide two explanations of the usage of *hosii*; one assumes *zibun* as the absolute self-identification in the Japanese human relationship, and the other assumes *zibun* as the relative self-identification in the Japanese human relationship.

2.2. Zibun as the absolute self-identification

The following four explanations of the usage of *hosii* are provided by Soga and Matsumoto (1978), Young and Nakajima-Okano (1984), Mizutani and Mizutani (1977), and Suzuki (1989), and are these explanations based on the absolute self-identification in the Japanese human relationship, which contradicts the reality of Japanese society. Their explanations are inadequate to explain
the usage of *hosii* because they assume the participants (the speaker, the hearer and the referent) in the situation are absolute individuals. There are some obvious counter examples to their explanations. Soga and Matsumoto explain *hosii* in their textbook for Japanese language learners who are English speakers, *Foundations of Japanese Language* (1978: 320). The explanation provided for the usage of *hosii* is only the English equivalent of *to want* and *Lit. (something) is desirable.* Given *want* as the only explanation of *hosii*, Japanese language learners assume that the function of *hosii* within the Japanese language system is the same as that of *want* within the English language system. This assumption is inaccurate because the function of *hosii* in Japanese does not completely overlap the function of *want* within English as shown in example (1) repeated below.

(1)# Senseless, kono kopii hosii desu ka?  
professeur this copy desire COP-DISTAL QUESTION

Example (1) is unacceptable because the sentence sounds rude, however their explanation does not prevent learners from creating such a question. Learners need a more detailed explanation of the function of *hosii* within the Japanese language system in order to use it correctly. More insightful explanations are available in the following textbooks.

Young and Nakajima-Okano introduce *hosii* in *Learn Japanese* (1984). The following is the explanation of *hosii* in this book.
Hoshii is an adjective meaning "something is wanted", "desire to have something", or "want." Hoshii means "I desire to have something." Usually this word is not used to refer to a second-person or third-person subject, and especially not in referring to a second person. Therefore, when serving a customer as a waiter or waitress, one would never use hoshii in asking the customer "What do you wish to have?"

Hoshii is most appropriately used in the first person, referring to what "I, myself, desire to have."

In the expression hoshii n desu ga, ga is relatively meaningless in the context. Literally ga means "but" or "although." Here, however, it serves as a softener; by using it to terminate the sentence, it softens the abruptness of the desire or hope of the subject person in a fashion characteristic of the Japanese (1984: 4).

Young and Nakajima-Okano's attempt to explain the usage of hoshii is still not enough to allow learners to use it appropriately. It fails to describe the difference in human relationships between a society where English is used and the Japanese society. Learners assume that what is meant by the "first person" in their explanation is the same as the first person in English, who is only the speaker. In fact the speaker may include the hearer or other person into his in-group in Japanese human relationship, depending on the situation. So their explanation is misleading in two regards. First, their explanation excludes the possibility of example (3) because they note that hoshii "is not used to refer to a second-person or third-person subject."

---
6 This romanization is Hepburn-style.
Example (3) is acceptable among the participants, who have a close relationship, such as friends or family members. This is acceptable because the speaker includes the hearer, his friend or his family member, into his in-group.

Second, Soga and Matsumoto explain that *hosii* can be used as what the speaker desires to have, but do not consider at all to the appropriateness of the overall usage. Closer examination suggests that depending on the discourse, this is often not the case. For example, consider the following in which a student expresses his desires to have the professor write her name.

(4)# Sensee, *koko ni namae o kaitte*  
*hosii desu*  
professor here to name OBJ write-GER  
desire COP-DISTAL

Example (4) is unacceptable because the speaker, a student, does not recognize the difference between the group which the hearer, his professor, belongs to and the group which he belongs. The fact that example (4) sounds as if the speaker includes the hearer into his in-group, which contradicts the reality of their social group difference. Thus, example (4) is unacceptable because it sounds rude to the hearer who is socially ranked higher than the speaker.
Young and Nakajima-Okano's explanation fails because they use the concept that is western/American culture norm as the basis of their explanation of the usage of *honnin* without regard to the system of social interaction among the Japanese. The basic unit of American society is the absolute individual, and each individual in the society has his own absolute self-identification. As cultural language systems are manifest in human relationship, the difference in the human relationship between the two cultures must be considered. English refers to the speaker as the first-person, the hearer as the second-person, and the person who is neither the speaker nor the hearer, but in referred to by the speaker or the hearer as the third-person. According to this definition, each participant is assumed to be an autonomous individual with their own territory. The basic unit of Japanese society, however, is a group, and each person identifies themselves by their relative position to others or in relation to the different group they belong (Makane (1967); Lebra (1976); Bachink (1982), among others). Ignoring the fact such group relationship in Japanese society is necessarily reflected in language use produces inadequate explanation of *honnin*. For instance, learners may think that English example (5) could be translated into Japanese example (6a), however the acceptable example is (6b).

(5) My teacher gave this book to my sister.
The reason why learners tend to translate the English example (5) into Japanese example (6a) is that learners assume that using *osgeninaru*, the honorific form of *ageru*, is acceptable since *ageru* means 'give to him/her/them' and that they do not know the fact that the speaker's sister is included into the speaker's in-group member in this situation. *Kudasaru* means 'give to me or member of my in-group'. *Ageru*, on the other hand, means 'give to a member of out-group.' Since the speaker's sister is a member of the speaker's in-group in this situation, *ageru* cannot be used. As this example shows, the human relationship which underlies language use must be considered. This ignorance of the nature of Japanese social interactional relationship is observed in the following explanation as well.

Mizutani and Mizutani provide the explanation of the usage of *hosii* in their textbook, *An Introduction to Modern Japanese* (1977). Unlike Young and Nakajima-Okano, they introduce *hosii* with -tai and -garu in the same lesson. -Tai is a suffix and shares some meaning with *hosii*, and -garu is a suffix commonly
used with hosii and -tai to indicate the overt expression of desires. They provide the following explanation.

......Hoshii is used by the speaker to talk about his own desires; hoshigaru is used by the speaker to refer to a third person's desires. 
ex. (Watashi-wa) misu-ga hoshii-desu. (I want some water.)
(Michiko-san-wa misu-o hoshigatte-imasu.
(Michiko wants some water.)
Hoshii follows -ga while hoshigaru follows -o.
Garu is used with other adjectives, too:
ex. A. Semu-desu-nee. (It's cold, isn't it?)
B. Ke. Kodomo-tachi mo samugatte-imasu. (Yes, the children say they're cold, too.)
Garu verbs cannot be used to talk about the desires of respected persons. It sounds strange to say Sensee-ga samugatte-imasu, since use of the word sensee shows respect and the -garu verb doesn't (1977: 175).

This comparison of the difference between hosii and hosigaru is Mizutani and Mizutani's strong feature, but their explanation is insufficient in four regards. First, and again, they state that hosii is used only by the speaker to talk about his own desire, but it has already been shown by example (3) that hosii can also be used by the speaker to talk about the desire of the hearer, when the hearer belongs to the speaker's in-group.

(3) Kono koppi, hosii?
this copy desire-DIRECT
'Do you want to have this copy?'

The failure to explain the acceptability of example (3) arises from the fact that they assume that the basic unit of the Japanese society is an independent individual who has an absolute self-
identification. In reality, hearers in Japanese discourse may be identified with the speaker, demonstrating that the basic unit of the Japanese society is not the independent individual but the interdependent individual who maintains his relative position within a group and with respect to members of other groups.

Second, Mizutani and Mizutani only describe the use of hosigaru to refer to the third person’s desires. However, hosigaru can be used by the speaker to refer to the desire of either himself or the hearer. A simple counter example is offered in Nihongo Kyōiku Jiten, which cites model examples of usages for teachers of Japanese as a foreign language.

(5) Watasi wa kodomo no toro
    I    TOP child  CCP-PRENUM approximate time

    norimono no omotya o
    ride    CCP-PRENUM toy   OBJ

    hosigatta.
    show the signs of wanting-DIRECT

    ‘When I was child I showed the signs of wanting to have a riding toy.’

In the above example the speaker uses hosigaru for describing his childhood desires. He detaches his childhood and talks about his childhood’s desire as if he would talk about another’s desire. Therefore, hosigaru can also be used for referring to the speaker’s desire.
Furthermore, Mizutani and Mizutani do not account for the possibility of using \textit{hosii} with \textit{n desu} to refer to the desire of someone other than the speaker without \textit{garu}. The following example shows that \textit{hosii} can be used in such instance.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Yamada-san ga hosii n desu}

Mr. Yamada SUBJ desire circumstance CUP-DISTAL

\textit{ka?} QUESTION

'Is it that Mr. Yamada wants this?'
\end{quote}

Example (6) is acceptable because the speaker is not directly asking about the desire of the referent to the hearer, but is asking of the situation can be described as that of 'the referent, Mr. Yamada, wants this.' By using the extended predicate, the speaker can refer to the referent's desire without \textit{garu}.

Finally, Mizutani and Mizutani also do not consider the acceptability of the following example in which \textit{garu} is used to refer to \textit{sensee} ('professor') with respect.

\begin{quote}
\textit{Yamada-sensee ga hosigatte}

Professor Yamada SUBJ show desire-GER

\textit{irasynimasita kedo.}

exist-POLITE-DISTAL but

'Professor Yamada was showing the sign of wanting this, but...'
\end{quote}

\footnote{The pattern, predicate = \textit{n desu}, is called the extended predicate and 'relates what precedes \textit{n} to something in the real world which is known or assumed to be known by the person addressed, as well as by the speaker' (Jorden and Noda 1987: 178).}
Example (7) is acceptable because the provider is not specified by the usage of -garu. However, they note that hosigaru (show the sign of wanting') sounds strange referring to the desires of sensee ('professor'). The unacceptability of their example, repeated below, is not due to the usage of -garu, but due to the usage of imasu ('exist-PLAIN-DISTAL').

(8) Sensee-ga samugatte imasu.
    Professor SUBJ show be cold-GER exist-PLAIN-DISTAL

Since imasu is distal, but not an honorific form, the usage does not show any respect to the speaker's superior referent, sensee 'professor'. The following example (9) is acceptable even though -garu is used in reference to sensee because irassyaimasu ('exist-POLITE-DISTAL') is used for referring to the professor's action instead of imasu, the plain form.

(9) Sensee-ga samugatte irassyaimasu.
    Professor SUBJ show be cold-GER exist-POLITE-DISTAL

'Professor is showing the sign of being cold.'

These counter examples show the shortcomings of Mizutani and Mizutani's explanation. This explanation alone is not sufficient to explain the usage of hosii.

Kamio hypothesizes the existence of psychological distance to the speaker for information depending on whether it belongs to the speaker or the hearer. The abstract territories to which the information may belong depend upon the content of the information. He categorizes these territories into: A) the territory which belongs to the speaker, but not to the hearer, B) the territory which belongs to both the speaker and the hearer, C) the territory which belongs to the hearer but not to the speaker, and D) the territory which does not belong to either the speaker or the hearer. Figure 1 illustrates these territories.

Figure 1 The speaker's territory of information (Kamio 1990: 46)

Examples of the kind of information considered follow. Depending on who is involved in these types of information, they are categorized as belonging to the speaker's territory (A), the hearer's territory (C), to the territory which is shared by the speaker and the hearer (B), or to the territory which is shared by neither the speaker nor the hearer (D).

- a. direct experience
- b. personal fact, news, story, etc.
- c. action, behavior, plan, etc.
- d. fact, news, story, etc. about close persons
- e. professional and other expertise fact, news, story, etc.
- f. geographical fact, news, story, etc.
The following are example sentences Kamié provides for each territory:

A) **Atama ga itai.**
   head SUBJ painful-DIRECT
   'I have a headache.'

B) **Ii tenki da ne.**
   good weather COP-DIRECT CONF
   'The weather is fine. right?'

C) **Netu ga ari soo da ne.**
   fever SUBJ be-STEM seem COP-DIRECT CONF
   'It seems that you have fever, right?'

D) **Arasuka no huyu va kibisi soo da.**
   Alaska COP-FRENCH winter TOP severe hearsay COP-DIRECT
   'I heard that the winter in Alaska is severe.'

Example (A) comes from the direct experience of the speaker, the speaker feels a headache, and this information, "having a headache", belongs to the speaker's territory. Example (B) would occur when two acquaintances meet on the street. Both the speaker and the hearer determine, for example, that "today's weather is fine," because of their direct experience the speaker and the hearer have when they see the blue sky. Example (C) comes from the hearer's direct-experience, the speaker does not feel any fever, but it seems the hearer has a fever, so the speaker uses
the nominal, soo⁶, to express that the information is not the speaker's direct experience. Also in example (C) the confirmation seeking particle, me, is used for seeking agreement from the hearer on the remark the speaker makes. Example (D) belongs to the area outside of the territories which belong neither to the speaker nor the hearer, and again the nominal, sooo, is used because the information is not the speaker's direct experience. However, the speaker does not use the confirmation seeking particle, me, since the information does not belong to the hearer's territory either.

Suzuki applies Kamio's theory in order to analyze the unacceptability of the following example.

(10)# Watasi ni itte hosii desu ka?
I to go-GER desire COP-DISTAL QUESTION

She argues that the content of the utterance invades the hearer's territory. She notes that when the content of the speaker's utterance refer to the territory which belongs to the hearer, the utterance sounds: 1) impolite or rude; 2) sarcastic, accusing or sermonistic; or 3) unnatural or unacceptable. She states that the hearer's desires, intentions, feelings, or abilities belong to territory C, the hearer's territory. But she contradicts herself when she presents the following example and admits its occasional acceptability among family members or close friends.

⁶ "Direct-style perfective or imperfective predicate X + sooo da/ = 'It is said to be true,' 'I hear that X is true'" (Jorden and Noda 1998: 234).
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(11) Watasī ni itte hosii?
I to go-SER desire-DIRECT
‘Do you want me to go?’

This example is acceptable because the hearer is assumed to belong to the speaker’s in-group. The speaker can ask the hearer’s desire as if the speaker is asking about his own desire.

As this example indicates, Suzuki’s argument is insufficient because Suzuki relies on the theory which assumes individuality or absolute self-identification of the Japanese human relationship. In this theory the speaker and the hearer are assumed to be individuals without regards to their group membership. This assumption is contradictory to reality since Japanese identify themselves by their relative position to others in the group or with other groups. In certain situations, the speaker would include the hearer into his in-group or his territory. As a result of neglecting the importance of the Japanese human relationship, recognition of relative position to others, Suzuki admits the contradiction to her hypothesis and points out the counter-example. Therefore, the theory of speaker’s territory of information, which is the basis of the explanation Suzuki provides for the unacceptability of her examples, is not sufficient to describe the usage of hosii.

Having examined these explanations, we can say that all explanations we have examined are assuming that the basic unit of the human relationship is the individual and that each individual
has an absolute self-identification. However, the absolute self-identification is not the concept of the human relationship in Japanese society. Hence, the usage of hosii should be explained by using the concept of the interdependency of group relationships. This is necessary because Japanese language use is one of the Japanese social behaviors which tightly relates to the Japanese human relationship. The following section will provide an explanation of the usage of hosii based on relative self-identification.

2.3. Zibun as the relative self-identification

The observations of the Japanese social behavior vary, but they agree at the point that the Japanese society is a group oriented society, and that the Japanese social behavior relates to its group orientation. The Japanese try to fit themselves into a group by assuming the relative positions that are suitable in the situation instead of preserving their own territories.

Doi (1971) states that one of the characteristics of Japanese social behavior is amae, interdependency. He describes that amae represents the Japanese tendency of being interdependent rather than being independent.

Another observation of the Japanese social behavior is made by Nakane (1970). She points out that Japanese society is a vertical society and that their relation depends on a hierarchical order. She claims that the Japanese social concept is represented
by the word, *ba* ('place'). According to her explanation, Japanese
try to fit into their *ba* within the vertical society, rather than
preserving their own individual territory.

Another researcher, Lebra, also notes that one of the
characteristics of Japanese behavior is occupying the proper-place
(1976:67). She points out that the Japanese word *bun* ('fraction;
internal part') illustrates this orientation and that *bun* is used
as the term for self, *zibun*. She describes that the concept of
*bun* has three implications all of which derive from an image of a
society which is an organic whole, where individuals are parts of
the organism. The implications of this viewpoint are: 1) the
individual is conceived as a fraction of the whole, 2) *bun-
holders are interdependent, and 3) every member of society is
supposed to be aware of his or her *bun*. Moreover she claims
that the Japanese try to maintain their relations to others within
the vertical society according to the particular situation.

Matsumoto (1988) forms a composite explanation about the
characteristics of the Japanese society by synthesizing
and others.

"A Japanese generally must understand where s/he
stands in relation to other members of the group or
society, and must acknowledge his/her dependence on
the others, and acknowledgement and maintenance of the
relative position of others, rather than preservation
of an individual's proper territory, governs all
social interaction" (1988: 45).
These observations are very important, and especially Lebra's observation will be discussed further and applied to the analysis of use of hosii in Chapter III.

2.3.1 The explanation based on the notion of group

Jorden and Noda (1989) include the Japanese social behavior or the notion of group in their formulation of the explanation of the usage of hosii. The explanation they provide is as follows.

The affective9 adjectival10 hosii functions as a double-ga, affective predicate:

Dare ga hosii? 'Who wants it?'
Nani ga hosii? 'What do you want?'
Nakamura-kun ga kore ga hosii kara... 'Nakamura wants this, so...'

These combinations are direct and assertive. They should not be considered exact equivalents of the more polite onegai-simasu11, moraitai, itadakita12, and so on when used in reference to what the speaker or members of his/her in-group want. Unlike the more polite forms, hosii also frequently refers to the desires of the out-group.

9 Affective predicates relate to "conditions or occurrences which come about apart from human decision, will or volition, such as understanding, needing, and being able" (Jorden and Noda 1987: 115).
10 'A Japanese adjectival is a word which has a number of forms, including one ending in -i and another in -kata' (Jorden and Noda 1987: 40).
11 'Onegai-simasu ('I make a request') is a polite verbal referring to the speaker's request; it show deference to the out-group toward whom the request is directed. It often occurs by itself in making a general request, the nature of which is obvious from the context (for example, in calling a waitress for service)' (Jorden and Noda 1987: 93).
12 'Morau and itadatu, its humble-polite equivalent, regularly refer to receiving by the in-group' (Jorden and Noda 1988: 125).
The sequence / verbal13 gerund14 + hosii/ expresses a desire to have the action of the verbal performed by others:

Kono hako o hatonde hosii.
'I want this box carried.'
Kono nimotu o todokete hosii.
'I want this luggage delivered.'

When the desire is for something NOT to be done, /-(a)ni de + hosii/ occurs:

Soo ivanai de hosii.
'I want [you] not to say that.'

If a nominal expresses the person by whom the action is or is not to be performed, it is followed by particle ni:

Arubaito ni kono konpyutaa no tukaikata o naratte hosii.
'I want the part-timer to learn how to use this computer.'

Note that the combination / gerund + hosii + to iu koto da/ regularly refers to the wishes of third parties.

WARNING: Do not confuse - tai forms with / gerund + hosii/ patterns. Compare tukuritai 'I want to make it' and tukutte hosii 'I want to have it made' (by someone else).

In all / gerund + hosii/ patterns, the substitution of moraitai or itadaikita for hosii results in a less demanding expression that indicates desire on the part of the speaker in terms of being a beneficiary of an action (1987: 12).

Unlike the explanation given by other researchers we have examined, Jorden and Noda analyze the usage of hosii from the

13 A Japanese verbal is "a word which has a number of different forms including one form ending in -manu and another in -masita" (Jorden and Noda 1987: 12).
14 The gerund (-te) form is a form which (1) links up with a the following predicate; and (2) implies a realized state or activity. By 'realized' is meant 'at last begun'; it may or may not be finished. In requests, it is realized state or activity that is asked for" (Jorden and Noda 1987: 163).
perspective of Japanese social behavior or the group-oriented point of view rather than that of the absolute self-identification or individuality of the participants in the situation. The authors note the notion of grouping which is essential to Japanese society.

Any Japanese belongs to social groups—the family, the school or the work—and of primary importance in determining the kind of language to be used on any occasion is the identification of these groups in the setting of the moment. The groups are constantly shifting depending on the participants and the speaker's viewpoint. Group affiliation is so basic that it is probably valid to consider an individual who, at the moment, is operating in isolation, as a "minimal in-group" (1987: 164).

They give the following example to show how the group boundary shifts.

... Let's consider Ms. Yamamoto, who works under Mr. Nishida, a top executive in a Japanese company. Within the in-group of the company, she of course refers to Mr. Nishida in polite language—whether speaking directly to him, or about him in conversing with her own peers. But when a member of an out-group—e.g., another company-visit—and asks for Nisida-san, who is a member of her (=Yamamoto's) in-group, even though Mr. Nishida outranks her within the organization, she refers to him as Nisida in speaking to the outsider. The polite —san is the kind of form that cannot be used of in-group members (including self, the smallest in—group) when talking to the out-group (1987: 165).

Jorden and Noda's explanation of the usage of hosii is related to the basic concept of Japanese social behavior and language use. Their explanation is more comprehensive. They
provide the explanation based on the notion of the speaker’s in-group and out-group, and they describe how *hosii* refers to the speaker’s out-group’s desire as well as the speaker’s in-group’s desire. This explains how examples (3), (5) and (6), repeated below, are acceptable even though they can not been acceptable according to other explanations that have been examined in section 2.2.1.

(3) **Kono kōpii, hosii?**
this copy desire-DIRECT

‘Do you want to have this copy?’

(5) **Watasi wa kodomo no koro**
TOP child COP-PRENUM approximate time

norimonono no omotya o
ride COP-PRENUM toy OBJ

hosigatta.
show the signs of wanting-DIRECT

‘When I was child I showed the signs of wanting to have a riding toy.’

(6) **Yamada-san ga hosii n desu ne?**
Mr. Yamada SUBJ desire circumstance COP-DISTAL CONF

‘Is it that Mr. Yamada wants this?’

Example (3) is acceptable according to Jorden and Noda’s explanation because *hosii* is used when the speaker refers to what the speaker or members of his in-group wants. The referent, who is also the hearer in this situation, is different from the speaker, but in this situation the referent is assumed to be in the speaker’s in-group. Since the referent is recognized as the
speaker's in-group member, the speaker can ask the desire of the referent as if he is asking about his own desire. Thus, example (3) is acceptable.

Example (5) is also acceptable even though it refers to watashi 'speaker' and hosigaru refers to the speaker's out-group's desire. This is because the speaker in example (5) detaches himself from his childhood and talks about his childhood desire as if he is an outsider talking about the desire.

Also example (6) is acceptable because hosii is used with n desu for sharing the situation in which 'Mr. Yamada wants this.' By using the extended predicate, the speaker in example (6) does not ask the referent's desire, but shares the situation with the referent. Asking about a desire is different from sharing the situation in which the desire of a third person is mentioned. Compare the difference the usage of hosii with n desu, example (6), repeated below and the usage of hosii by itself, example (12).

(6) Kore ga hosii n desu kedo
this SUBJ desire circumstance COP-DISTAL but
'It is that I want this, but'

(12)² Kore ga hosii desu kedo
this SUBJ desire COP-DISTAL but

In example (6) the speaker presents the situation to the hearer. By doing so, the speaker creates and distance between the person who desires something and the speaker. This presentation is such
that the benefit is not directly exchanged between the speaker and the hearer, making the use of hosii in (6) acceptable in this situation.

On the other hand, the speaker in example (12) asks if the speaker desires to receive the benefit. This represents the case in which the speaker and the hearer directly exchange the benefit. Stating what the speaker wants is understood as abruptness which should be avoided in a situation where the hearer is the speaker's out-group member. Therefore, example (12) is unacceptable.

Jorden and Noda's explanation is more accurate than what is given in the other explanations and is applicable to explaining such examples as (3), (4), (5), (6) and (10). Their explanation is applicable because the basis of their explanation is based on the Japanese social behavior which underlies the language.

Their explanation however, does not prevent learners from saying the following example in which the speaker wants to ask about the desire of a referent, somebody other than the hearer.

(13)# Yamada-san ga hosii?
Mr. Yamada SUBJ desire-DIRECT

Example (13) sounds as if the hearer wants Mr. Yamada. The shortcoming of Jorden and Noda's explanation is that their explanation distinguishes the referent in terms of the speaker's in-group and out-group, but does not allow for the situation in which the referent is differentiated from the hearer.
The explanation which Jorden and Noda provide is more applicable than the others, however, their explanation still has its shortcoming.

2.4. Summary

The usage of はosi cannot be explained adequately within the framework where an absolute self-identification is assumed. In addition, the relative position between the provider and the beneficiary is need to be clearly defined, and the difference between the referent and the hearer must be considered. These will be incorporated in describing the use of はosi in modern spoken Japanese in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III
HOSII IN MODERN SPOKEN JAPANESE

3.1. Introduction

In this chapter I will first present the context in which hosii is used in modern spoken Japanese. Then, I will explain
the use of hosii. My rationale for the use of hosii is based on
Lebra's observation of Japanese social behavior.

3.2. The semantics and the syntax of hosii

Hosii is an adjectival, and the use of hosii connotes both
the provider who may provide the action or the object which is
desired, and the beneficiary who desires to receive the benefit
from the provider\(^{15}\). Suppose a situation in which Taroo is
talking to his friend Satiko, and compare examples, (14) and (15)
below, both of which are possible.

(14) **Kekkon site hosii.**
    marry do-GER desire-DIRECT
    'I want someone to marry for me.'

(15) **Kekkon sitai.**
    marry wants to do-DIRECT
    'I want to marry.'

\(^{15}\) In this thesis I will not discuss the phonology of hosii.
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Example (14) connotes the existence of a provider. In this particular situation, the utterance of (14) is likely to be interpreted as an act of proposal, in which Taro expresses the desire for Satiko to marry him. In contrast, the utterance of example (19) expresses Taro's desire to marry in an abstract sense.

Syntactically, hosii can be used by itself as part of a single predicate as in example (16), or immediately following a verbal gerund to form a complex adjectival predicate as in example (17).

(16) Sore ga hosii.
that SUSJ desire-DIRECT
'I want that.'

(17) Kaite hosii.
write-GER desire-PLAIN DIRECT
'I want you to write (it).'

An acceptability of the use of hosii in Japanese relates to the relationship between the provider and the beneficiary who may or may not be the immediate participants in the situation. The immediate participants in the situation are defined as: 1) the speaker who makes linguistic utterances, 2) the hearer who receives the utterances, and 3) the referent of hosii who is parlayed to have certain desire. The hearer and the referent will be subcategorized into either the speaker's in-group member or the

26 The referent could also be the hearer or the speaker.
According to the relationship to the referent, the speaker chooses the speech style, plain or polite. Plain style is used for the speaker’s in-group referent, and polite style is used for the speaker’s out-group referent. Both example (19) and (20) are direct-style, signaling that they are addressed to the speaker’s in-group. However, the speaker in example (19) uses the plain style to refer to his in-group referent, Mr. Yamada, but the

Another consideration for the participants of the conversation would be their sexual difference. Following the convention of Jordes and Noda (1987), I consider the difference as “a matter of the speech-style” (1987: 228). They state that there are items that are used exclusively by male or female, but in most cases it is more accurate to speak of the utterances as being more “blunt” or “gentle”.

(16) Sore ga hosii.
that SUBJ desire-DIRECT
'I want that.'

(18) Sore ga hosii desu.
that SUBJ desire COP-DISTAL

speaker’s out-group member. According to the relation to the hearer, the speaker will choose the appropriate speech styles, casual or careful style depending on the hearer. Casual style is used with in-group hearer, and this is often marked by the use of direct style in final predicate. Careful style is used for out-group hearer, and this is typically signaled by the use of distal style in final predicate. Example (16) provides an example of direct style final predicate, and an example (18) of distal style final predicate.
speaker in example (20) uses the honorific/polite style to refer to his out-group referent, Professor Yamada.

(19) **Yamada-kun ga hosigatte**
Mr. Yamada SUBJ show the sign of wanting-GER

iru yo.
exist-PLAIN-DIRECT ASSERTION

'Mr. Yamada is showing the sign of wanting, I tell you.'

(20) **Yamada-sensee ga hosigatte**
Professor Yamada SUBJ show the sign of wanting-GER

irassharu yo.
exist-POLITE-DIRECT ASSERTION

'Professor Yamada is showing the sign of wanting, I tell you.'

The use of *hosii* depends on the permissibility of assigning the role of provider and the beneficiary to the speaker or the hearer depending on the context of speech. That permissibility, in turn depends on the social relationship the speaker have with other participants of the conversation. Libra (1976) has a usable account of social interaction in terms of situation. Her analysis focus on the relationship that is determined by situation as well as social positions that participants occupy in particular situation.

3.3. Situational Interaction

As we already examined, the Japanese society is a group oriented society, and a Japanese social behavior relates to group
orientation. Japanese will try to maintain their relative position to others. Relative position or relationship between persons is determined to a large extent by the social structure. However, Lebra notes, the Japanese differentiate their behavior by the specific situation (1976: 112). That is, if the situation is defined as an intimate situation, then intimate behavior is observed between the participants who do not necessarily know each other. On the other hand, even though the participants have a close relationship, if the situation is not defined as an intimate situation, the intimate behavior is not observed.

The factors which determine the situations form two dichotomies; uti-soto ('in side-out side') and omote-ura ('front-back'). Uti and soto are defined respectively as ‘in, inside, internal, private’ and ‘out, outside, external, public’ (Lebra 1976:112). Lebra states that the line of demarcation between uti and soto varies widely: it may be a physical structure, an individual person, a family, a group of playmates, a school, a company a village, or a nation. Zibun, ‘self’, is the minimum insider or in-group boundary. The dichotomy of omote and ura are described as “front” or what is exposed to public attention and “back” or what is hidden from the public eye. These dichotomies may be combined to create four situational domains. According to Lebra, since the uti and omote situation is unlikely to occur, there are only three situations. Figure (2) is the combination of these dichotomies and the distribution of the three
situations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>uti (&quot;in&quot;)</th>
<th>omote (&quot;front&quot;)</th>
<th>ura (&quot;back&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>soto (&quot;out&quot;)</td>
<td>Ritual</td>
<td>Anomic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Situations for the interaction (Lebra 1976: 112)

In order to explain the characteristic of each situation, Lebra presents the participants, "Ego" who is the central actor in the situation and "Alter" who is Ego's social object in the situation, and the behavior which characterizes the situation. Ego is overlapped with the speaker, and Alter is overlapped with the hearer and/or the referent. In the following sections I will present examples of the use of hosii in these three kinds of situations and interaction and explain the acceptability in these three kinds of situations and interaction. When the use of hosii is unacceptable, I will present a comparable acceptable example and discuss the difference between the two examples.

3.3.1. Hosii in the intimate situation

The use of hosii in the intimate situation is observed where Ego recognizes Alter as his in-group member, and is explained by the characteristics of behavior in the intimate situation, 'communication of unity' and 'display of spontaneity' (Lebra 1976). The following example is one of the acceptable uses of hosii in the intimate situation.
(3) **Kono kopii hosii?**
*this copy desire-DIRECT*

'Do you want this copy?'

This example is acceptable even though the referent of *hosii*, or the beneficiary, is not the speaker. This is because in this situation the speaker can assume the hearer to be a member of in-group. Having included the hearer into his in-group, the speaker can shift his viewpoint to the hearer's perspective and ask the question from the view of the hearer. This may be illustrated using a vector to indicate the direction of transfer of an action or an object. The arrow end indicates the beneficiary side of the interaction. The dot indicates the location of the speaker's viewpoint. When this is shifted to the hearer's position, this is shown by adding (S) on the same side as the H.

(3) **Kono kopii hosii?**
*this copy desire-DIRECT*

'Do you want this copy?'

\[ S \longrightarrow \cdot H \cdot (S) \]

provider beneficiary

Figure 3 The viewpoint-shift of S to H in an intimate situation

Shifting of viewpoint is also observed in English. When the speaker is on the way to the place where the hearer is, the speaker may say "I'm coming" instead of saying "I'm going." From the speaker's viewpoint, he is "going" to the hearer's place. But the speaker says "I'm coming" because he looks at the situation
from the hearer’s viewpoint; the hearer will see the speaker as if he is "coming." The sharing of the same viewpoint is understood as the communication of unity, which is characterized in Japanese, **ittaikan** ('feeling of oneness'). Lebra’s description of **ittaikan** follows.

The ultimate form of such communication (semitelerepathic communication) is **ittaikan** ('feeling of oneness'), a sense of fusion between Ego and Alter. Ego then feels Alter’s pleasure and pain as though they are his own (1976: 115).

Because of **ittaikan** example (3) is acceptable.

This intimate behavior, **ittaikan** ('feeling of oneness'), also explains the acceptability of example (11) provided by Suzuki and repeated below.

(11) *Watasi ni itte hosii?*  
I at go-GER desire-DIRECT  
‘Do you want me to go?’

This example contradicts Suzuki’s hypothesis based on Kamio’s theory. That is, the speaker’s utterance should not refer to the hearer’s territory because the utterance sounds rude. Instead of applying Kamio’s theory, the acceptability of this question among close friends and family members is explained by the characteristic of intimate behaviors in an intimate situation. The viewpoint of the speaker can be shifted to the hearer’s perspective, and is understood as an expression of **ittaikan** ('feeling of oneness').
Another characteristic behavior of the intimate situation is a display of spontaneity, which will explain the acceptability of example (21) below.

(21) **Kore o katte hosii.**
    this GRJ buy-GER desire-PLAIN-DIRECT
    'I wants you to buy this.'

In this example the speaker assigns the hearer to be the provider without consulting if that would be acceptable to the hearer. Lakoff states that one of the politeness rules is to give options (1973: 298). In other words, not to give options is understood as being intimate. Lebra describes that absence of polite forms, which is considered as a violation of the conventional norm in ritual situation, is permitted or even endorsed in an intimate interaction\(^\text{18}\). Thus, in this situation asserting the hearer's action is understood as a display of spontaneity.

**Hosii** can be used when a boss asks his subordinate to copy a paper for him.

(22) **Kore kopii site hosii naa.**
    this copy do-GER desire-DIRECT CONF
    'I want you to copy this.'

They do not have equal status, but the boss may identify his subordinate as a member of his in-group, though the subordinate cannot reciprocate this. Thus, from the boss's perspective, but

\(^{18}\) Naturally, there is a implied limitation for being rude.
not from the subordinates perspective, this situation is defined as the intimate situation. The speaker uses direct-style because the hearer is considered to be a member of the speaker in this situation.

In an intimate situation, hosii can be used when the hearer is also the referent of hosii as in example (3) which is repeated below.

(3) **Kono kōpiī hosii?**
    this copy desire-DIRECT
    'Do you want this copy?'

Hosii can also be used when the referent is somebody other than the hearer and the speaker. Consider the following examples. In examples (23) and (24) the referents are the providers of an action, a state, or an object. In examples (25) and (26) the referents are the beneficiaries. The referents in examples (23) and (25) belong to the speaker's in-group whereas the referents in examples (24) and (26) belong to the speaker's out-group.

(23) **Yamada-kun ni kite hosii me.**
    Mr. Yamada at come-GER desire CONF
    'I want Mr. Yamada to come, right?'

(24) **Yamada-sensei ni irassyatte**
    Professor Yamada at come-POLITE-GER
    hosii me.
    desire-PLAIN-DIRECT CONF
    'I want Professor Yamada to come, right?'
(25) Kore hosigatte ita?
    this show the sign of wanting-GER exist-DIRECT
    ‘Was he showing the sign of wanting this?’

(26) Yamada-sensei ga sono kopii
    professor Yamada SUBJ that copy
    hosigatte irasseyatta
    show the sign of wanting-GER exist-POLITE-DIRECT
    kedo.
    but
    ‘Professor Yamada was showing his desire of having
     that copy, but...’

Examples, (24) and (26), are acceptable when these are uttered in
Professor Yamada’s absence. Since Professor Yamada is not there,
he cannot be the provider. Thus, the utterance of (24) or (26),
does not count as the act of assigning the provider’s role to the
members of the speaker’s out-group. However, when Professor
Yamada is present in the situation, these examples become
unacceptable. The utterance of (24) or (26) in such a situation
can be interpreted as assigning the role of a provider to a member
of the speaker’s out-group even though the speaker’s utterance is
not addressed to this referent. I will discuss the case in which
the speaker exchanges the benefit with his out-group referent in
the next section.

We have examined the acceptability of hosii in the intimate
situation by applying intimate social behaviors, ittsaikan
(‘feeling of oneness’), and display of spontaneity. We can say
that when the situation is defined as the intimate situation,
hosii is acceptable unless the speaker’s out-group referent is
present in the situation. In the following section, I will present the use of hosii in the ritual situation.

3.4.2. Hosii in the ritual situation

Lebra states that in the ritual situation Ego defines Alter as an outsider whose opinion has some influence over him, and Ego thinks Alter would exercise his influence variably depending on his performance (Lebra 1976: 120). Therefore, Ego tries to maintain each other's 'face' both defensively and aggressively (Lebra 1976: 121). The following is an example in which a student tries to ask his professor if the professor wants a copy.

(27)# Kopii site hosii desu ka?
copy do-GER desire COP-DISTAL QUESTION

Lebra notes that in the ritual situation Ego is required to keep at a distance, not only physically but emotionally, from Alter in order to maintain each other's face. Thus, communication of unity is inappropriate in this situation. Example (27) is unacceptable because the speaker shifts his viewpoint to the hearer's and thereby includes the hearer into his domain or ingroup. Ittaihan ('feeling of oneness') is prohibited in this

---

19 Following E. Goffman (1967) I use the concept of "face" as "socially-given self-image." This definition may overlap the notion of the positive 'face' which is proposed by Brown and Levinson (1987). However, the notion of negative 'face', another constituent of 'face', which is proposed by Brown and Levinson and is defined as "the want of every 'competent adult member' that his actions be unimpeded by others", does not overlap the Japanese concept of 'face.'
situation because of the relative position of the speaker and the hearer. To avoid ittai kan it would be more appropriate to ask the following question.

(28) Kepii simasyoo ka?
   copy shall do-CONSULTATIVE QUESTION
   'Shall I copy this?'

In this question, the speaker suggests to be the provider without assuming the beneficiary. Lebra states that in the ritual situation Ego must be sensitive to Alter’s unexpressed needs. This is understood as anticipatory communication. Lebra describes that anticipatory communication, being referred to as omoi yari ("empathy"), is one of the concrete mechanisms for defending face. Asking what the hearer wants is understood as lack of omoi yari. Lebra states that instead of Ego’s having to tell what he wants, others around him guess and accommodate his needs, sparing him of the embarrassment, and the higher one’s status, the more others will anticipate his wants. The speaker’s omoi yari toward the hearer is expressed in example (28) by saying simasyoo ka instead of hosii desu ka, making (28) acceptable.

In the following example of hosii in a statement, the speaker, a student, presumes his professor’s future action of providing the writing of the name.
Presuming an out-group member's future action is impolite. In the intimate situation, being casual is understood as a display of spontaneity. In the ritual situation direct self-exposure is the most risky behavior for losing face, and Ego should suppress his spontaneity. The speaker in example (4) presumes that his professor is to be his provider without having had any indication from the professor of his willingness to do so. The unacceptability of example (4) parallels the unacceptability of the use of hosii in a question in ritual situation, example (27). Example (27) is unacceptable because it presumes the hearer to be the beneficiary without any indication by the hearer to want to be the beneficiary.

The speaker in this situation should give a choice to the hearer. One way of giving a choice is using hosii with n desu 'the case is that...', that is, as the first predicate of the extended predicate. By using the extended predicate the speaker relates his desire to the real world which is known or assumed to be known by the person addressed, as well as by the speaker (Jorden and Noda 1976: 178). Consider the following example.

'It's that I want you to write your name.'
This example is acceptable because the speaker does not directly express his desire to have the hearer write her name, but instead shares with the hearer the situation in which someone desires to have another person's name written. The utterance of (29) points to the existence of such a situation (Noda 1990), and the particle ga, signals the open-endedness of that act. The hearer is invited to make the connection between the abstract situation and the fact that the person who has the desire is actually the speaker.

Using -Kudasai ('kindly do...') is also acceptable in this situation.

(30) Name o kaite kudasai
name OBJ write-GER give me-IMPERATIVE

'Give me your action of writing your name.'

According to Jorden and Noda's definition, the request by using -kudasai, which is the imperative form of the polite verbal of giving kudasara ' [out-group] gives to in-group', is direct and abrupt, but the politeness of the verbal itself and the fact that the request is made in terms of something that is to be given to the speaker make the combination of verbal gerund and -kudasai relatively polite (1987: 164). Jorden and Noda also describe that by replacing -kudasai with a corresponding distal-style negative question, kudasaimasen ka ('Would you kind enough to do...'), the combination, kaite kudasaimasen ka as in example (31) below, makes the request less direct and significantly softer.
The use of the negative in (31) is related to its use in invitations, implying the shared action or togetherness, and creating a feeling of closeness, empathy, understanding and warmth (Jorden and Noda 1987: 242).

In a ritual situation, hosii cannot be used in a statement when there is no indication from the hearer to want to be the provider. The following exchange (32) and (33a) will demonstrate the case in which the potential provider acknowledges his willingness to be the provider. This exchange may take place when a professor (P) have published a book and wants his student (S) to read it.

(32) P: Kore yatto deta n da yo, naka naka ii hyooban de ne. 
Oh, I finally published it, the book, quite good reputation.

(33a) S: A, watasi ni mo zehi 
Oh, I also by all means, 
make one want to receive POLITE,
read it.

(33) S: A, watasi ni mo zehi 
Oh, I also by all means,
make one read CONSALITIVE-GER want to receive POLITE,
desu.
COP-DISTAL

‘Oh, I would like to receive the action of making me read it, too.’
The student uses *itadaku* ('receive') with *-tai* ('want') to request the professor to allow him to read his copy of the book. The acceptability of the use of *itadakitai* is that: 1) *itadaku* is humble polite, and 2) *-tai* does not specify the provider but implies the provider. However, *hosii* could also be used appropriately in this situation as shown below.

(34) S: *A, watasi ni mo zehi yomasete* desire COP-DISTAL
   *Oh, I also by all means make one read-*GER
   *hosii desu.*
   'Oh, I want you to make me read it.'

*Hosii* cannot be used when the speaker presumes the hearer to be his provider or beneficiary without justification to do so. But *hosii* is acceptable in the situation for exchange (34) because the professor has already hinted to be the provider, should the student wants to be the beneficiary. The sense of interdependence (*amae*) can operate here, making it better for the speaker to explicate his wants. In the ritual situation the student has to be sensitive to his professor’s desire him to read his book which is only hinted. The professor has already implied that he is willing to be the provider, so the student has to show his capacity of receiving the benefit. Lebra states that in order to maintain face aggressively, one’s dignity must be proven by exhibiting one’s capacity or attitude that matches the claimed dignity. *Hosii* shows the speaker’s desire to be the beneficiary,
and by doing so the speaker’s attitude matches the professor’s hinted desire. Lebra states that aggressive face necessitates self-exhibition and ostentation while defensive face demands inhibition and minimization of self-exposure. Therefore, the use of hosii in this situation is not only acceptable, but also desirable. Of course, itadakita is also used in this situation and is more polite.

Having shown that hosii in a statement when the speaker’s out-group hearer expresses her willingness to be the provider, hosii can also be used when the assumed provider is other than the speaker and the hearer, Yamada-san, in example (35)

(35) Yamada-san ni kite hosii desu ne.
Mr. Yamada at come-GER desire COP-DISTAL CONF
'I want Mr. Yamada to come, right?'

In this example the speaker do not assign the role of the provider or the beneficiary to the hearer. The provider of the speaker’s desire is Yamada-san. However, this example becomes unacceptable when 1) the referent, Mr. Yamada is the hearer’s in-group member, or 2) Mr. Yamada is present in the situation. Hosii is unacceptable in the first instance because of the ittai kan (‘feeling of oneness’) between the hearer and Mr. Yamada. Hosii is unacceptable in the second instance because Mr. Yamada also becomes a hearer, even though the speaker’s utterance is not directed to him.
Hosii can be used when the provider is other than the speaker and the hearer. When the beneficiary is other than the speaker, hosigaru is used. Consider example (36) below.

(36) **Yamada-san ga kore o hosigatte**

Mr. Yamada SUBJ this OBJ show the sign of wanting-GER
imasete exist-PLAIN-DISTAL but
kedo 'Mr. Yamada was wanting this, but...'

This example is acceptable because the speaker and the hearer do not exchange the benefit. However, this example becomes unacceptable when: 1) the referent, Mr. Yamada, is the speaker’s in-group member and wants the speaker’s out-group hearer to be the provider, 2) Mr. Yamada is the hearer’s in-group member and wants the speaker to be the provider, or 3) Mr. Yamada is the speaker’s out-group member and is present in the situation. Hosigaru is unacceptable in the first and the second instances because Mr. Yamada is considered to be in the same group as the speaker’s in-group or the hearer’s in-group. The same restrictions apply as these for the use of hosii when the hearer is presumed to be the beneficiary or the provider. Hosigaru is unacceptable in the third instance because the restriction for the use of hosii applies as if Mr. Yamada were the hearer. The speaker’s utterance is not addressed to Mr. Yamada, but, Mr. Yamada may act the hearer since he is present in the situation.
Hosii in the ritual situation, in which the speaker recognizes the hearer as his out-group member, is complex. Hosii is used in the ritual situation when the speaker's in-group member is the beneficiary. We can say that hosii can be appropriately used in a statement when the speaker's out-group member offers to be the provider as in example (34). Even though this does not apply, it is possible if the speaker's out-group provider is not present in the situation or the provider does not belong to the hearer's in-group as in example (35). When the beneficiary is other than the speaker, hosigaru is used. Hosigaru is acceptable in a statement when the beneficiary is the hearer's out-group member as in example (36). Even though the beneficiary is the hearer's out-group, hosigaru becomes unacceptable when the beneficiary is the speaker's in-group member and wants the hearer to be the provider, or is present in the situation.

3.4.3. Hosii in the anomic situation

According to Lebra, the anomic situation is characterized by the anomic behavior, an action toward Alter who is recognized as an outsider but has no influence on Ego and with whom Ego feels no need to maintain a "front." According to Lebra the anomic behavior emerges to Ego when the situation happens to be: totally new to him, makes him anonymous, or the situation happens to be a struggle for survival and power contest (1976: 131-132). For example, the following example would be uttered in a situation
where the speaker asks many hearers, whom he does not know, if they want copies.

(37) **Hosii hito imasu ka?**  
desire person exist-DISTAL QUESTION  
'Is there anyone who wants this?'

Act/object will be exchanged between the speaker and the hearer, but in this situation the relative position between the speaker and the hearer is not significant because the speaker does not know them and do not need to interact with them beyond the immediate point. Moreover the speaker and the hearer cannot have a defined relationship because there are a multiple member of hearers who may have different relationships with the speaker.

3.5. Summary

The use of **hosii** varies according to the situation. **Hosii** is acceptable in the intimate situation or the anomic situation, that is, when the speaker need not be concerned with the maintenance of public front (**omote**). It is also acceptable in the ritual situation when the speaker does not presume his out-group hearer to be his provider or beneficiary. **Hosii** is used appropriately when: 1) the hearer has indicated his willingness to be the provider (when **hosii** is used in a statement), or 2) the assumed provider (for **hosii** in a statement) is someone who is an out-group member of the hearer and is not present in the situation. When the beneficiary is other than the speaker,
hosigaru is used. Hosigaru is acceptable in the ritual situation because the use of hosii with -garu does not specify the provider. However, the use of hosigaru becomes unacceptable in both a statement and a question when: 1) the beneficiary is the speaker's in-group member and wants the hearer's in-group member to be his provider or is present in the situation, 2) the beneficiary is the hearer's in-group member and wants the speaker's in-group member to be his provider.
4.2.1. Speech styles

First, the learners of Japanese language should learn the concept of speech styles because "every use of the Japanese language requires a stylistic choice" (Jorden and Noda 1987: 32).

There are two dichotomies of the speech style: the direct-distal style and the plain-polite style. The difference between the distal and direct styles shows the relationship between the speaker and the hearer. On the other hand, the difference between the plain and polite shows the relation between the speaker and the referent\(^{20}\). The following figure is provided by Jorden and Noda to show speech differences of the verb forms, all of which represent the meaning of 'go.' Direct forms are used to hearers who are assumed by the speaker to be close to the speaker. Distal forms are used when distance is perceived or placed by the speaker with respect to the hearer. Honorific polite forms are used in reference to those who are considered to be outsiders to the speaker, and humble polite forms are used in reference to the insider's action that involves an outsider. No such group boundary is observed in the use of plain forms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAIN</th>
<th>POLITE</th>
<th>HONORIFIC</th>
<th>HUMBLE</th>
<th>DIRECT</th>
<th>DISTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>iku</td>
<td>irassharu</td>
<td>mairu</td>
<td>ikimasu</td>
<td>irasshaimasu</td>
<td>mairimasu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4 Speech differences (Jorden and Noda 1987: 227)

---

\(^{20}\) The referent is the person who is referred by the speaker, so there are times when the hearer is the referent.
The notion of group and status orientation determine the choice of speech style, and without these the Japanese language cannot be used effectively. Therefore speech style differences should be introduced first.

4.2.2. Consultative form, -masyoo, and the verbal stem

Second, the consultative form should be introduced before hosii, because hosii cannot be used in the situation when the superior hearer is the beneficiary as shown by example (1) repeated below. In such instance, the consultative form may be used as in (28).

(1) Sensee, kono kopii hosii desu

professor this copy desire COP-DISTAL

ka?

QUESTION

(28) Kopii simasyoo

copy shall do-CONSULTATIVE QUESTION

' Shall I copy this?'

Asking the superior hearer to explicate his wants is understood as lack of omoiyari ('empathy') and should be avoided in the ritual situation. Instead of asking the hearer to be his beneficiary, when the speaker should detects the hearer’s desire, the hearer can suggest to perform the relevant action. -Masyoo is the distal-style consultative (Jorden and Noda 1987: 175) and suggests the speaker’s willingness to do the things mentioned.
There are other ways of suggesting the speaker’s willingness to perform things as in example (38) and (39) following.

(38) Kono kopii o tukai ni narimasu ka?
this copy use-POLITE-DISTAL QUESTION
'Are you going to use it?'

(39) Kono kopii ga oiriyoo desitara,
this copy SUBJ need-POLITE-DISTAL-CONDITIONAL
kopii site okimasu
copy do-GER put it for the future use-PLAIN-DISTAL
but
gan.

'If you need this copy, I will copy it for the future use, but...'

The speaker in example (38) asks if the hearer needs the name without indicating any potential provider. The speaker in (39) states that the speaker will make the copies without implying that the hearer is the beneficiary. In both cases, the hearer will benefit from the speaker’s action, but that relationship in not encoded in the sentences. However, -masyoo is simpler in form than these others because -masyoo is preceded by a verbal stem. Once the distal form is introduced, the verbal stem is simpler to form than that of the verbal gerund which precedes -kudasai and hosii. Hence, -masyoo should be introduced as a consultative form with the verbal stem before -kudasai and hosii. The consultative form also allows the speaker to talk about the hearer’s wants without being rude. It is culturally important that learners learn to attend to other people’s wishes before
expressing one's request, which may be done with -kudasai or hosii.

4.2.3. Request form, -kudasai, and the verbal gerund

After introducing the consultative form, -masayo, a request form, kudasai ('please give'), should be introduced. This form can be used in a wider situation than hosii, including when the superior hearer is to be the provider as shown in example (30).

(30) Name e kaite kudasai
    name OBJ write-GER give me-IMPERATIVE
    'Give me your action of writing your name.'

Hosii cannot be used in such an instance, as shown in example (4)

(4)# Sensee, koko ni name e kaite hosii desu.
    professor here to name OBJ write desire COP-DISTAL

Assigning the hearer to be the speaker's beneficiary without having been invited to do so by the hearer is abrupt. This abruptness is understood as a display of spontaneity which should be avoided in the ritual situation. Instead of assigning action, the speaker should request or ask to be the beneficiary.

According to Jorden and Noda's definition, the request by using -kudasai, which is the imperative form of the polite verbal of giving kudasaru 'out-group gives to in-group', is direct and abrupt, but the politeness of the verbal itself and the fact that the request is made in terms of something that is to be given to
the speaker make the combination of verbal gerund and -kudasai relatively polite (1987: 164). At the same time, the use of the imperative form, -kudasai make it clear that the hearer is requested to take the providers role. It is not a statement that assumes the providership on the part of the hearer, which example (4) is.

Reason for introducing -kudasai after -masyoo, rather than before, is that -kudasai is preceded by the verbal gerund, and the verbal gerund is more complex to form than the verbal stem which -masyoo follows.

4.2.4. Expressing the speaker's in-group desire, -tai, and -garu

As the next step, the notion of expressing the speaker's in-group's desire by using -tai should be introduced before hosii because the use of -tai is simpler than that of hosii in that it connotes only the beneficiary, but not the provider. Compare the following examples.

(18) Kekkon site hosii.
    marry do desire-DIRECT

'I want you to marry for me.'

(19) Kekkon sitai.
    marry wants to do-DIRECT

'I want to marry.'

-Tai only requires consideration for the beneficiary whereas hosii requires consideration for both the beneficiary and the
_X-garu_ (‘express X’) is combined with an adjectival to indicate the overt expression of the condition of someone other that the speaker. It should be introduced at the same time with -_taï_ because -_taï_ only expresses the speaker’s in-group desire. -_Garu_ may be combined with the adjectival -_taï_ to express the desire of someone other than the speaker. -_Garu_, like -_taï_, but unlike _hosii_, involves the beneficiary only. It does not specify the existence of the provider, which _hosii_ necessarily implies. Compare the following examples.

(40) _Yamada-san ga kekkon sitai._
Mr. Yamada SUBJ marry want

(41) _Yamada-san ga kekkon sitagatte_  
Mr. Yamada SUBJ marry show the sign of wanting-GER  
iru. exist-PLAIN-DIRECT

‘Mr. Yamada is showing the sign of wanting to marry.’

Example (40) is awkward because the speaker should not be able to state what an outsider, Mr. Yamada, wants. Example (41), on the other hand, is a description of Mr. Yamada’s expression of his desire. Once the function of -_garu_ in combination with -_taï_ is learned, then learners will be ready to make the step to use -_garu_ with _hosii_. Therefore, -_taï_ and -_garu_ should be introduced before _hosii_.


-Tai should be introduced after -masyoo, but before the extended predicate because -tai is preceded by the verbal stem which is already introduced with -masyoo. But the extended predicate is preceded by the citation form of verbal, adjectival and copula. The use of the extended predicate is a more general phenomenon, but, it is more complex than that of -tai. Therefore, -tai should be introduced before the extended predicate and hosii.

4.2.5. The notion of sharing information and the citation form

After introducing the way of expressing the speaker's in-group desire by using -tai, the extended predicate should be introduced because the -tai form often occurs in the combination /-tai a desu/ (Jorden and Noda 1987: 177). Jorden and Noda note that nominal a relates what precedes a to something in the real world which is known or assumed to be known by the person addressed, to what is being said by the speaker, and often serves as an explanation (1987: 178).

(41) Kekkon sitai a desu.
    marry want to do circumstance COP-DISTAL
    'It's that I want to marry.'

-Tai with a desu does not express the speaker's in-group desire but shares the situation in which the speaker refers to his desire. Sharing of the situation is not understood as lack of omoiyari ('empathy') or display of spontaneity. The speaker
detaches himself from the situation of his wanting something, and presents only the situation. There is no risk for assigning either the speaker or the hearer to be the beneficiary or the provider because the speaker only presents the situation as something that is connected to the present situation. -Tai with the extended predicate can be used appropriately as the final predicate and a statement in the ritual situation in the same way that hosii is can. This is particularly true when the sentences ends with the open-ended particle ga, or its variants, kedo, keredo or keradomo. However, the use of -taf or hosii in the extended predicate question is not appropriate, since this points to the situation that is indicated by the way the hearer is.

(42)#Kekkon sitai n desu ka? marry want to do circumstance COP-DISTAL QUESTION

(43)#Kekkon site hosii n desu ka? marry do-GER desire circumstance COP-DISTAL QUESTION

Examples (42) and (43) are both inappropriate because it asks if the situation is that the hearer wants to be married. Since this situation can be presented by the hearer only, it sounds as if the hearer is displaying the desire to marry.

4.2.6. The verbal of receiving, morau

Finally, the receiving verbal, morau should be introduced after -taf before hosii. Both -taf and hosii express the desire of receiving the benefit. But -taf indicates only the
beneficiary whereas *hosii* involves both the provider and the beneficiary. The consideration of both the provider and the beneficiary can be introduced by the verbal of receiving, *morau*. By comparing *morau* and *itadaku*, the humble form of *morau*, the notion of relative position between the provider and the beneficiary can also be introduced. Compare the following examples.

(44) *Yamada-kun kara moratta.*
Mr. Yamada from receive-PLAIN-DIRECT
'I received it from Mr. Yamada.'

(45) *Yamada-sensee kara itadaita.*
professor Yamada from receive-POLITE-DIRECT
'I received it from Professor Yamada.'

Both example (44) and (45) are acceptable because the speaker uses appropriate verbals for indicating his relative position to the referent. The speaker uses *morau* when the item is received from Yamada-kun and uses *itadaku* when the item is received from Yamada-sensee. However, *morau* expresses only the action of receiving. In order to express the desire of receiving the action or the things, as *hosii* does, *moraitai*, the combination of *morau* and -tai should be introduced. The use of *moraitai* is similar to *hosii*.

(46) #*Kono kopii moraitai desu ka?*
this copy want to receive COP-DISTAL QUESTION

(47) #*Kono kopii hosii desu ka?*
this copy desire COP-DISTAL QUESTION
These examples are unacceptable because the speaker asserts the hearer's action without knowing if it is acceptable for the hearer. Once the acceptability of the combination of morau and -tai is learned, then learners will be ready to take the step to the use of hosii.

4.3. Situational Presentation

The usage of hosii relates to the relationship among the speaker, the hearer and the third person, and the assignability of the provider and the beneficiary to these conversation participants. This relationship among the speaker, the hearer and the third person is determined by their relative social positions and that are overed at the time of speech. The use of hosii must be introduced with the situation that influences the relationship of conversation participants, and the assignment of the provider and the beneficiary that is indicated in the utterances. In particular, the situations in which the use of hosii is inappropriate must be shown and present its misuse. Situational presentation gives learners a better understanding of how to use hosii.
4.4. Summary

The usage of *hosii* is complex. Learners should be introduced systematically, beginning with simpler concepts or grammatical items which relate to the use of *hosii* to more difficult ones. In each step, the existence of provider or beneficiary or both, and the permissibility of assigning these roles to the conversation participants must be discussed. The social and situational relationship these conversations participants observe are crucially important.
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