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This thesis explicates the language-as-process theory (LAPT) (*gengo katei setsu*) developed by Japanese linguist Tokieda Motoki (1900-1967). The LAPT is a theory of language that views language as a mental process. The LAPT defines this mental process as action of expressing one’s own thinking as well as understanding the thinking of others. With this definition of language at its core, the theory includes three essential factors that condition language activity: *shutai* (a performing subject), *bamen* (relevant social and psychological context including addressee and attendant circumstances, etc), and *sozai* (contents to be spoken or written). *Shutai’s* expressive valuation of language and skills to realize valued expressions are also considered indispensable elements of language. It is also important in the LAPT’s system that there are two distinct standpoints in language phenomena: a subjective standpoint and an observational one. These ideas constitute the LAPT’s fundamentals. Consequently, the LAPT has a wide range of applicability to language phenomena. It deals with issues concerning language communication, and from there, it proceeds to explain the social nature of language in terms of interpersonal relations. It also treats literary works from the perspective of language activity. Finally, it theorizes the history of language as a history of language life.
Although Tokieda’s theory has been well recognized and has received some criticism within Japanese linguistic circles, only a few studies that treat the theory have appeared in academic scholarship in English. George Bedell’s *Kokugaku Grammatical Theory* (1968), and Amanda Stinchecum’s *Narrative Voice in The Tale of Genji* (1985) are two of these. Some limiting issues, however, can be identified in both studies. The former focuses on grammatical ideas rather than the LAPT as the whole that it is. The latter applied core ideas of the LAPT such as its triadic preconditions for language to its analysis of narrative texts, but it goes beyond Tokieda’s approach to literary works. A careful review of each piece directs us to other features of Tokieda’s theory and to a consideration of how they all fit together.

In order to better understand the essence of the LAPT, this thesis examines how its inventor, Tokieda Motoki, developed the theory, and some of the factors that influenced him. Tokieda began his study of the Japanese language around 1920 amidst a nationalistic fervor for language and its study in Japan. He soon became doubtful of uncritically following the principles of Western linguistics, and argued that in traditional Japanese linguistics, a more scientific aspect could be identified. As early as 1924, he proposed a hypothesis in his graduation thesis that language is a process of expression. As he discovered that studies of language in Japan evolved within an applied philology (*koten tyûshaku* 古典註釈) and *waka* poetics (*kagaku* 歌学), Tokieda slightly modified his hypothesis: language is action of expression and understanding. Utilizing ideas of phenomenology, Tokieda substantiated his hypothesis, and eventually in 1941, published *Kokugogaku genron*, ‘Principles of the Study of the Japanese language,’ in which he
explicated the fundamental ideas of his theory of language. He continued to expand his theoretical framework while engaged in discussions of practical issues, such as language education and language policy. Finally, in 1955, he revealed a new system of the LAPT in *Kokugogaku genron zokuhen*, ‘Principles of the Study of the Japanese Language, a Supplementary Volume.’ Thus, the LAPT became a theory that situated itself in analyzing and understanding issues such as linguistic communication, the social nature of language, literature as language, language life, and the history of language.
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Introduction

Modern approaches to the study of language have included quite a variety of fields, subfields, schools, and theories: anthropological linguistics, applied linguistics, behaviorist linguistics, cognitive linguistics, dialectology, discourse and conversation analysis, forensic linguistics, functionalist linguistics, generative grammar, historical linguistics, language acquisition, lexicography, phonemics, phonetics, phonology, pragmatics, psycholinguistics, rhetoric, semantics, semiotics, sociolinguistics, speech act theory, stratificational linguistics, syntax, systemic-functional grammar, and the list goes on. Just to look at these names is enough to make one appreciate their status as thriving scholarly enterprises. We may wonder, however, if these fields and theories all deal with the same object of research, i.e., “language”; or, we may want to ask why linguistics can produce such a wide variety of theories and areas of research; would this variety be a normal phenomenon for any kind of science? Would it be possible at all to identify a set of principles that could integrate all of them? After all, what is language per se? Have any philosophers given these questions definitive answers?

I myself started to think about these questions after I became familiar with one theory of language. That theory and its inventor are the objects of the present study. The theory is called gengo katei setsu 言語過程説 in Japanese, and the inventor is Tokieda Motoki
時枝誠記 (1900-1967), a Japanese linguist, or kokugogakushi 国語学者, lit. ‘scholar of the national language.’ Gengo katei setsu can be translated into English as ‘theory of language as process,’ or ‘language-as-process theory.’ I must first let my readers know that I am not a linguist, so much as a student of linguistics. I enjoyed reading and studying literary works for several years as a college student, and although I have taken some graduate-level courses in general linguistics, sociolinguistics, and Japanese linguistics, my focus of study was mostly either English/American or Japanese literature, until I came to know of Tokieda’s theory, just a few years ago in a book called Kokugogaku genron 国語学原論 (originally published in 1941), in which Tokieda explained his theory of language. The theory immediately attracted me because it deals with literary expression as one of its objects of examination. It is true that we have seen many scholars of literature applying linguistic theories of their choice to their analyses of literary texts. Most of those attempts, however, are after all literary studies, not linguistic studies. In contrast, Tokieda’s theory of language is applicable to the analysis of literary works without separating them from its system of study.

**Purpose and Organization**

The present study aims to delineate and explicate an overview of the system of the gengo katei setsu as a whole. What I have not tried to do, partly because of my own present limitations, is either critically examine or evaluate Tokieda’s theory from another theoretical viewpoint. Instead, I have tried as much as possible to describe what I could
understand of Tokieda’s theory. In fact, I believe that reading his representative work, *Kogugogaku genron*, just once or twice will not guarantee a reader a full understanding of the theory. My reviews of two representative works that dealt with Tokieda’s theory in some way or the other will show us some difficulties in interpreting different details of the theory. Hence, the present study is organized so that it serves as a resource for better understanding the *gengo katei setsu* in its entirety. In Chapter One, I will describe the theory’s fundamental ideas, followed by a review of two American studies’ construals of Tokieda’s theory. Chapter Two examines in some detail the process of how Tokieda developed and organized his ideas into a systematic theory of language.

**Rationale**

Tokieda Motoki and his theory of language are well recognized within the tradition of *kokugogaku* 国語学 ‘the study of the national language’ in Japan. In fact, his *Kogugogaku genron* was only recently republished. His grammatical theory continues to be referenced. Despite its established position in Japan, the theory remains largely unknown in Western linguistic circles. The present study tries to offer a comprehensive picture of the theory for English-speaking readers, with the following two assumptions in mind.

1. The theory is unique in that it starts from a set of principles that define language, and with those principles, it offers heuristics for understanding a wide range of language-related phenomena, from language policy to literature.
2. Although the theory appears to share some of its characteristics with certain subfields of modern linguistics such as pragmatics and sociolinguistics, there are differences as well in the way they approach language phenomena as their object of study.

Limitations

Because the focus of the present study is on the general framework and the fundamentals of *gengo katei setsu*, I have not included any detailed analyses of concrete language phenomena. For the same reason, I have not made comparisons with other major linguistic theories. These are left for future study.
Chapter 1: Fundamentals of Language-as-Process Theory

1.1. Overview: Tokieda Motoki and his theory of language

In this chapter, my focus is on depicting an outline of the theory called gengo katei setsu 言語過程説, which was developed largely in the 1930s by the Japanese linguist, Tokieda Motoki 時枝誠記 (1900-1967). My primary standpoint in rendering this is within the general study of language, not linguistics in the restricted sense of the modern Western academic discipline. As for the phrase “study of language,” I have chosen this term to indicate the broadest possible range of scholarly approaches to understanding language phenomena. In order to secure this position, it is required in the first place for the present author as well as the reader to be, for now, as uncommitted as possible toward any preconceptions about ‘language’ per se and the study of it.

For convenience’s sake, Tokieda’s gengo katei setsu will hereafter be referred to as language-as-process theory (LAPT). As I have become acquainted with the complexity and implications of the LAPT through just a few years of study, I became quite convinced that it can offer to language studies in general a significant fundamental perspective and a theoretical basis for a wide range of issues discussed in present-day academia concerning language. In other words, its perspective on language and the resulting fundamental ideas may help provide a possible solution for increasingly
specialized research practices when a unifying, interdisciplinary perspective becomes necessary.

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part offers a brief introduction to Tokieda’s theory of language followed by the fundamental ideas of the LAPT. The second part presents my two reviews of works in English that have dealt with his theory. The two studies that I will review are among just a few in Western academia that treat Tokieda’s ideas substantially. My review of these works will also offer some points of discussion for how we can interpret and understand the LAPT.

The Language-as-process theory, as the name suggests, is a theory based on a view of language as a kind of process, which, as we will see, was a mental process. Tokieda held this processual view of language as early as 1924, when he completed his graduation thesis\(^1\) although it was yet to be developed into something that could be called a “theory”. How this view was developed from his earliest academic work will be discussed in Chapter 2. Later in his academic career, Tokieda went on further to define “language” per se, as the object of a scientific inquiry from a processual perspective. His definition held that language is a mental process of expressing and understanding thought, which is in other words, a type of action unique to humans. Given this definition of language, Tokieda identified three essential conditions that provide for, or enable the realization of

\(^1\) His undergraduate thesis was titled *Nihon ni okeru gengo kannen no hattatsu oyobi gengo kenkyû no mokuteki to sono hôhô (Meiji izen)* 'The development of language awareness of the Japanese: their purposes and methods of the study of language,' and was published by Meiji Shoin in 1976 as the first volume of the series, *Tokieda Motoki Hakushi chosakusen* 時枝誠記博士著作選 ‘Selected writings of Tokieda Motoki.’
such active processes, namely, shutai 主体, bamen 場面, and sozai 素材. Roughly speaking, shutai refers to a performing subject, i.e., a person who speaks, listens, reads, or writes; bamen is social/psychological context in which the shutai performs language action, including his/her construal of the addressee, the setting with its own specifics, etc; and sozai what the subject’s action is about. In a simpler and more concrete way, we can describe these conditions as follows: a speaker (shutai) speaks to someone (in the bamen) about something (sozai) (2007a, 57). This triangular set of concepts will be further explained in Section 1.2.4. The definition of language as the mental process of a type of human action and the notion of the essential elements of shutai, bamen, and sozai promised the consideration of other issues such as language skills and shutai’s expressive valuation of language action, the social nature of language based on the concept of the language communication, the relationship between the language action and other human activities, as well as that holding between literature and language. Most of these issues will be discussed in Sections 1.2 and 2.5.

Tokieda and his LAPT have not been extensively introduced into, let alone seriously studied within, English-speaking circles of linguistics and Asian studies; only a few exceptions exist and these are examined in Section 1.3. Even among linguists in Japan, except for scholars of kokugogaku, it is questionable that Tokieda’s theory has been seriously studied any more than its western counterparts, such as Saussurian linguistics and generative grammar. Within kokugogaku, however, Tokieda’s achievement has been
well recognized. In fact, some of his major works cannot be ignored by any history of language studies in twentieth-century Japan. A recent re-publication of his monumental work, *Kokugogaku genron* 国語学原論, ‘Principles of Japanese linguistics,’ (hereafter referred to as *Genron*), can be seen as a sign of re-valuation of his work among certain Japanese intellectuals. Apart from Tokieda’s achievements in the study of language, it should also be pointed out that there has been a certain amount of critical attention to Tokieda in the context of the Japanese imperialism and its language policy during a few decades before 1945. I will not examine this side of issues unless it is crucial to the understanding of his theory of language. A comprehensive account of Tokieda’s influence on the study of language in Japan is also beyond the scope of the present study.

### 1.2 Fundamental ideas of the LAPT

#### 1.2.1. Definition of language

In Tokieda’s LAPT, language is defined in the simplest terms as the action of expressing one’s own thinking as well as that of understanding/interpreting other persons’ thinking.

---

2 His name seems to be most commonly remembered by those who are interested in the study of Japanese language as one of the major grammarians of the past century; the grammatical system Tokieda had developed is now referred to in the academic discourse as *Tokieda bunpō* 時枝文法 ‘Tokieda grammar,’ which has established its place among the ‘four major grammatical systems’ (*yondai bunpō* 四大文法) of Japanese language; the other three are the *Yamada bunpō* 山田文法 of Yamada Yoshio (1873-1958), the *Matsushita bunpō* 松下文法 of Matsushita Daizaburō 松下大三郎 (1878-1935), and the *Hashimoto bunpō* 橋本文法 of Hashimoto Shinkichi 橋本進吉 (1882-1945).

3 *Kokugogaku genron* was originally published in 1941, followed by its successive work *Kokugogaku genron zokuhen* 国語学原論続編 in 1955, by Iwanami Shoten 岩波書店, and their pocket book editions appeared in 2007 and 2008, respectively.

4 Yasuda (1998) is one of the works on this issue, among others.
If we adopt this definition of language in a strict manner, such an expression as “language use” is allowed only in a figurative sense because there is a fundamental difference between the activity of expression and the activity of “using” language. How is this definition, or view, of language related to the name of the theory, ‘the language-as-process theory’? It is true that the name of the theory per se does not reflect the above definition of language. We may well ask why it is not something like kōi to shite no gengo ‘language-as-action theory,’ (行為としての言語). The term ‘process,’ or katei 過程 in Japanese, came partly from Tokieda’s doubts about the modern Western linguistics’ view of language. Tokieda criticized the practice of analyzing language into its elements such as sounds, letters/characters, and thoughts/concepts, or treating its physical, physiological, and psychological aspects separately (1956a, 140-142). He characterized those practices as componential, as opposed to processual, which he took to be a truer characterization. When Tokieda criticized in his book, Genron (1941), certain ideas and views in Saussure’s Cours de linguistique générale, he characterized its view of language as gengo kōsei kan 言語構成観, ‘view of language as a componential entity,’

5 Although Tokieda apparently had the ability to read the original in French, he mostly referred to the translation done by Japanese linguist Kobayashi Hideo 小林英夫 (1903-1978). Tokieda’s understanding and criticism of Saussurean linguistic theory has been questioned and criticized by some Japanese linguists and scholars of kokugogaku 国語学 ‘study of national (Japanese) language,’ notably Hattori Shirō 服部四郎 (1908-1995) and Okubo Tadatoshi 大久保忠利 (1909-1990), among others. Examination of these historical debates between Tokieda and other Japanese scholars is beyond the scope of the present study although it will provide insights into not only why Tokieda’s ideas were controversial but also how Tokieda responded to the criticism of his theory and thereby explained what he meant.
and thus quite different from his own gengo katei kan 言語過程観, ‘view of language as process’ (104). Tokieda believed that what was described in Saussure’s *Cours* came from defining a unit of language, *langue*, as a static entity, separate from action, composed of sound (image) and meaning/concept, which essentially differs from his processual view of language, where sound image and concept are two the phases in a process of language action (see Figure 1 on p. 76).

If we have to think of language as the activity, or actions, of expression as well as one of understanding expression, the question is what characteristics are unique to language in comparison with other kinds of human activities. Tokieda talks about activities of fine arts such as music, painting, and sculpture as the action of expression, which we can compare with those of language. Tokieda finds music among others closer to language in that both share a temporal aspect in their process of expression.

... 音楽においては、その展開が感情情緒の起伏流動に対応し、それに直結するのであるが、言語・文章においては、音声や語彙が、外界の事物や感情に直接に結び付くのではなく、それらに対する概念的把握と、そのような対象に対する思惟を表現するものである。

... In music, its progress corresponds with and is connected to the flow of feelings and emotions. In written and spoken language, however, the sound and lexicon do not connect directly to things and events in the external world or (inner) feelings and emotions, but what they express is thinking (*shi’i* 思惟) upon such objects (things, events, feelings, and emotions). (1967, 5)

---

6 Tokieda did not talk much about other forms of art, such as cinematography, dance, drama, etc. This comparative approach to describing essential characteristics of language as a form of expression is, however, an interesting issue open to further discussion.

7 Unless otherwise noted, all the quoted texts in Japanese were translated by the present author.
Thus, Tokieda clarifies the difference between language and other activities of expression, focusing on what these activities express and how. After all, language is the action of expressing one’s thinking about objects out in the world and in our minds.

Another important question, then, is what “thinking” is. “Thinking” has sometimes been construed as something we “do” moment by moment, by “using” our language. In the LAPT, where language is construed as the activity of expressing “thinking,” we need to deny such a conception of “thinking” as “utilizing” a distinct and separate “language.” Tokieda understood this “thinking” in a way that owed much to the phenomenological tradition in philosophy, as follows.

‘Thinking,’ then, refers to a function (or operation) of a self, in which it operates over and unifies the external world in its variety. In this case, it may be allowed that not only this operational function of the self, but also the objects of that function constitute the meaning of ‘thinking.’

Tokieda referred to two Japanese dictionaries of philosophy for the definition of *shi’i* 思惟. He does not provide bibliographical information for the two dictionaries except for their titles. He cites their definitions as follows:

**Shi’i** – Regarding human cognition in general, it refers to its aspect of active unification as opposed to its passive, diversified aspect. Traditionally, it is considered as in opposition to the sensory perception. (*Tetsugaku jiten*, entry for *shi’i*)

**Shi’i** – Also called *shikô*. In psychological terms, a kind of apperception, that is, intended unification of representations. In other words, the self’s active function of unification. (*Tetsugaku shôjiten*)
1.2.2. A science of language and a definition of grammar

In order to understand the LAPT, it is a necessity to know Tokieda’s view of and stance toward how we can and should study language. Let us look at how he describes the role of theory in general.

...非常に複雑混沌とした現象というようなものを処理するのは理論である。理論によってこれを簡単に処理する、簡単なものとしてこれを把握する、そのために理論が必要じゃないかというふうに考えております。

... It is a theory that brings order to things like extremely complex, chaotic phenomena. By means of a theory, we deal with these phenomena easily, and grasp them as simple things; for this reason, I think, theories are necessary. (1968b, 102)

Tokieda also explains the role of a theory in the study of language:

It is a hypothetical theory of language that leads us to the recognition of language. We normally call such a theory a view of language. A system for the study of language, in particular, can be seen as the product of breaking down and further developing such a view, or hypothetical theory, of language, and re-constructing it in a theoretical manner. This (process) follows from the very nature of the object of the study, i.e., language, its nature being such that it never lets us see its whole picture in a concrete way; we can only recognize language by means of a net or lens that picks up the phenomena of language. (1965a, 4)
As noted previously of how Tokieda tried to characterize language, his approach to the study of language is based on comparison with various other kinds of activities of expression. This approach follows naturally from his view of language. The following statement of Tokieda reveals his attitude toward the ultimate objective of the study of language.

To think of language as an expression means that the unique characteristics of language will be revealed as the features it shares with other forms of expression and the differences between them are clarified. (1967, 3)

Tokieda offers a distinctive notion of grammar. He argues that grammar is a basic and necessary form or mold that enables a person to process his/her shi’i 思惟, ‘thinking’; he compares the grammar of language to the skeleton of a human body (1967, 3). He also emphasizes that a system of a grammar should reflect the actual practice of the language action, saying that in a sense, our ‘judgment of a theory’s value is dependent upon the extent to which it can be applied effectively to language activities as they are actually practiced’ (1954, 1).

Tokieda’s approach to the (grammatical) units of language is also to be noted. In Japanese, there were traditionally three terms for referring to the distinctive units of language, namely, go 語, bun 文, and bunshô 文章 or danwa 談話; these correspond to the linguistic terms in English, word, sentence, and (the last two) discourse, respectively. Tokieda claims that modern Western linguistics’ approach to defining these units has
been influenced by ways of thinking in the nineteenth-century natural sciences, specifically, the atomic theory (1968b, 28). Such a notion, according to Tokieda, led linguists at the time to seek to define the smallest meaningful unit of language. Tokieda criticized this approach to defining the units of language, largely because of its inability to capture the most concrete and larger units of language phenomena, those that current Western linguistics defines as discourse phenomena, as legitimate feature of its object of (grammatical) study.

Tokieda’s approach instead is to first acknowledge each of those traditionally recognized units – *go*, *bun*, and *bunshô/danwa* – as a given, distinct, unified whole, and then try to characterize each of them as units; Tokieda characterized this approach as *zentaironteki* 全体論的, ‘holistic.’ The atomistic approach tends to explain what defines a linguistic unit largely in terms of the combination of smaller units into larger ones; e.g., a sentence is a combination of words. Tokieda’s approach tries to identify a unique set of principles that defines each of these traditional linguistic units.10

---

9 Tokieda’s discussion of atomic and holistic approaches can be seen in “*Gengo katei setsu no kiso ni aru shomondai* 言語過程説の基礎にある諸問題,” (1968, 1-115). Morioka (1968, 220-225) has pointed out some similarities between Tokieda’s holistic approach, not just in his grammatical theory but in the LAPT as a whole, and the fundamental ideas of Gestalt psychology, although Morioka did not believe the latter directly influenced the development of the core ideas of the LAPT.

10 For detailed discussion of Tokieda’s approach to the linguistic units, see pp. 239-258 in *Genron*. 
1.2.3. Position/standpoint of the observer and of the performing subject

In *Genron*, Tokieda explicates two positions, or standpoints (*tachiba* 立場) crucial in language, i.e., in language activities (38-55). First of all, the analyst must recognize the standpoint of a person who performs a language act. Second, there is also the standpoint of the observer and/or analyst of such a performed act. In other words, the former is the first person, or *shutai*’s standpoint and the latter, the standpoint of someone outside the context of language action. The former is called *shutaiteki tachiba* 主体的立場, ‘agentive subject’s standpoint.’ The language action from this position includes expressing and understanding in language, appreciating aesthetic aspects of language in, e.g. reading a literary text, and selecting certain expressions over others when performing in specific situations. The second *tachiba* is the *kansatsuteki tachiba* 観察的立場, ‘observational standpoint,’ a position outside the language action from which a person, typically a researcher, observes language phenomena in order to analyze and describe the phenomena in an objective manner.

Although Tokieda emphasizes the distinction of these two standpoints in language, he does not neglect to mention the relationship between the two. He maintains that the observing standpoint is made possible by the subjective standpoint, since one can fully “observe” and describe a language phenomenon only after s/he “re-experiences”¹¹ it in his/her subjective standpoint. This process of “re-experiencing” somebody else’s

---

¹¹ Tokieda’s term in Japanese is “再経験し追体験する” (2007a, 35).
expression is what we normally call interpretation. If we cannot interpret a certain text or utterance correctly, we simply lack the grounds on which to analyze it.

1.2.4. Conditions that realize language phenomena

As I will briefly discuss in the review of Stinchecum (1985) in Section 1.3.2, another crucial element of the LAPT’s system is the triad of preconditions for realizing language action. These conditions are so essential that Tokieda repeatedly mentioned them in many of his studies on linguistic phenomena, including literary expressions. First of all, since the LAPT defines language as human action, there has to be a person who performs it. As already noted, this performing subject is what Tokieda calls the shutai 主体. The language action cannot be conceptualized as such without a shutai. As long as we define language as action, the shutai is an indispensable precondition of linguistic phenomena. Given this performing subject, we can also think about what the shutai expresses to whom and in what situation. Things that the shutai tries to express are called sozai 素材. The social/psychological field, or domain in which the shutai expresses his/her thinking in language is called the bamen 場面 (2007a, 55-74).12

Among these conditions that enable the realization of language expression, the most difficult to explicate is bamen. Bamen can simply be translated as ‘scene,’ ‘situation,’ or ‘context.’ However, these translations do not explicate the concept of Tokieda’s bamen. The crucial point in understanding this concept is that it is essentially anything that

---

12 We find a somewhat similar notion in M.A.K. Halliday’s “context of situation,” and its parameters of “field,” “tenor,” and “mode” (1985).
affects the shutai’s consciousness, feelings, and perceptions (2007a, 60-61). The implication of bamen then is that when we observe a certain language act and describe its bamen, we have to consider the shutai’s subjective mental state rather than the mere objective, physical setting surrounding that act.

1.2.5. Expressive valuation and skill in language action

Another important notion that characterizes the LAPT is the performing subject’s expressive valuation (kachi ishiki 価値意識) and the skill (gijutsu 技術) that realize a valued expression in language action (2007a, 124-141). Tokieda adopted the former concept to explain why some people, in some contexts, value the ‘standard language’ over their dialects, or vice versa (2007a, 124). In another example (2007a, 124-125), he talked about a situation in which a shutai talks in a polite way while conversing with a certain person. In that case, the shutai talks in that way because she values that way of talking in that particular bamen. Thus, whether or not a shutai expresses her thought in a certain way is partly dependent upon her expressive valuation of her language action in relation to various features of that particular bamen. Obviously enough, however, one can talk in a polite way only because she knows how to talk that way; this means that she has a skill to express her thought in that way. The skill, then, is required in order for a shutai to be able to realize an effective, appropriate, or ideal piece of action of expression (2007a, 125). Thus, learning to speak in an appropriate manner in a certain socio-cultural situation is to acquire certain skills. Emphasizing shutai’s expressive valuation and the skill to manifest those values as different expressive options as one of the essential
characteristics of language, Tokieda insists that the study of language should naturally be tied to practical aspects of language; as a result, he criticizes a grammatical system that does not reflect practices in real life (2007a, 134-135).

1.3. Two studies on the LAPT in the West

So far as I have been able to find out, there is not a single scholarly work written in English that is solely devoted to Tokieda and his theory of language. There are, however, a few works that have dealt seriously with these subjects, but only as part of a larger project. Among those works, two that I find worthwhile for the present study are Bedell (1968) and Stinchecum (1985).¹³ My objective here in reviewing these two works is to provide examples of how their academic audiences in North America, very limited as they apparently were, would have been led to understand and evaluate Tokieda’s theory. I chose these two based on two criteria: (1) how much Tokieda’s ideas are weighted in each work; (2) how much the central subject of each work is related to the issues of language. There may be other works that I have not discovered but should have reviewed in the present study, but I leave those to future inquiries. For now, however, the following reviews will provide us enough points of discussion as to how Tokieda’s ideas and the system of the LAPT as a whole are, in such academic circles, in need of a fuller and/or more accurate treatment.

¹³ Other works that refer to or utilize Tokieda’s theory include Maynard 1987, Iwasaki 1993, etc. in sociolinguistics and discourse/conversation analysis; Karatani (1995), Kamei (2002), Yoda (2004), etc. in literary studies; and Sakai (1991) in the intellectual history of 18th century Japan.
1.3.1. Bedell (1968)

The primary objective of Bedell’s dissertation (1968) is, in his terms, “to describe the linguistic theory which is inherent in kokugaku grammar, and to assess the impact of this theory on the subsequent development of grammar in Japan” (ii). It is to be noted that Bedell takes a “frame of reference” through which he conducts a critical examination not only of kokugaku grammar but also on any other theoretical ideas of language and grammar mentioned in the work, including Tokieda’s.\textsuperscript{14} The structure of his dissertation reflects this objective; following the introduction of Chapter I, Chapter II describes and examines the content of kokugaku grammatical theory as a whole; Chapter III discusses the relationship between two theoretical traditions, namely, kokugaku grammar and European grammar. The final chapter concentrates on Tokieda’s theory and its grammatical system in relation to kokugaku grammar and the then influential linguistic movement both in the West and Japan, which is now characterized as structuralism.

It is clear that Bedell treats Tokieda’s ideas not so much as a theory of language as a whole but as a grammatical system considered in relation to kokugaku grammar.\textsuperscript{15} The findings of Bedell are significant in that they reveal the intimate genealogy, as one might call it, between the two grammatical systems as Bedell characterizes it. It has to be also clarified here, however, that there are necessarily limitations in Bedell’s characterization

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{14} Bedell’s standpoint as to the definition of, or view of, language as an object of scientific inquiry can be understood from his “section B. Generative Grammar,” in chapter I, pp. 8-11.

\textsuperscript{15} Kokugaku 国学 grammar is a set of grammatical theories developed by Kokugakusha 国学者 ‘scholars of national studies’ in the seventeenth through mid-nineteenth century Japan.
\end{footnotesize}
of Tokieda’s work, which he himself would have been fully aware of, that left his account short of describing the LAPT in its entirety, as I summarize in the following points:

(1) Since the primary object of Bedell’s study is *kokugaku* grammar, Tokieda and his theory are dealt with only partially, within Bedell’s discussions of *kokugaku* grammatical theory.

(2) In the chapter specifically dealing with Tokieda, the focus is on his grammatical theory, not his language theory in its entirety.\(^{16}\)

(3) A more detailed analysis and description of the formation of the LAPT is left to others.

(4) Taking generative theory as the analyst’s basic frame of reference can potentially prevent one from appreciating essential characteristics of other theories, such as Tokieda’s, in their own rights.

What the present study hopes to offer as a complement as to the issues listed above are:

(1) to take Tokieda’s theory of language in its entirety as the primary object of study; (2) to clarify what Tokieda meant by “grammar” as opposed to “language” and his explicit attitudes in formulating a grammatical work and a work of language theory;\(^ {17}\) (3) since Bedell focused mainly on Saussurean structuralism as the historical context in which Tokieda developed his LAPT,\(^ {18}\) there is a need to go further into other Western as well as *kokugaku* influences by closer examination of a variety of works authored by Tokieda;\(^ {19}\)

(4) the present study does not ground itself in any particular linguistic theory, and takes

---

\(^{16}\) Bedell (1968) states that he “will treat Tokieda’s grammatical theory as a more or less independent sub-system without paying much attention to the full range of his ideas” (180). In addition, he assumes that “Tokieda would no doubt have objected to any separation of this sort” (p. 196, in footnotes #10). The present study will look at Tokieda’s grammatical ideas within the larger system of Tokieda’s thoughts on linguistic science, with the LAPT being one of their central principles.

\(^{17}\) This will be discussed in Section 1.2.2.

\(^{18}\) Bedell (1968), pp. 176-180.

\(^{19}\) See Sections 2.3 and 2.4.
as objective and critical a standpoint as possible toward any kinds of views and theories, old or new, mainstream or traditional.

1.3.2. Stinchecum (1985)

Unlike Bedell (1968), Stinchecum (1985) brings up Tokieda’s theory within the framework of literary studies. Stinchecum’s central interest is in the manipulation of narrative voice in classical Japanese texts, specifically *Genji monogatari* (*The Tale of Genji*), and how it affects our reading of the work. Through the examination of the narrative voice in *Genji monogatari*, Stinchecum argues for the importance of the literary concepts “irony” and “aesthetic distance.”

... [the] thesis of this study, which is that manipulation of narrative voice in the *Genji monogatari* establishes aesthetic distance between the reader and the fictional world, and this in turn gives rise to irony in our reading of the work. (Stinchecum, 3)

Tokieda’s ideas, such as *bamen* 場面 and *shutai* 主体, play an important role in supporting Stinchecum’s analysis of narrative voice. It is to be noted however that Tokieda himself never dealt with these concepts in the context of explicating narrative voice. Moreover, the concept of narrative, or *katari* 言語, was never treated within the system of the LAPT. Thus, since the concepts of *bamen* and *shutai* were developed in an essentially different context from what Stinchecum’s study is about, we need first to clarify how Stinchecum understood these ideas.

Stinchecum says the concept of subject that she developed in her work was “derived from and reflects that of the Japanese linguist, Tokieda Motoki” (p. 71). Let us look at
how she explains the concept of *shutai*, which is usually translated as ‘subject,’
developed by Tokieda.

When I speak of the subject of narrative, or the subject of a particular passage, it is a
somewhat figurative expansion of Tokieda’s concept of the subject (speaker) of
expression. (Stinchecum, 72)

What she exactly means by the “somewhat figurative expansion” here is not fully
explicated but it is of import to understand why she expands Tokieda’s notion of *shutai*.
Elsewhere she says:

Tokieda refers to the subject as the speaker, or that which acts in the act of expression,
that which forms an utterance. We can amplify this to include narrative and assert that
the subject is the active principle in discourse. (Stinchecum, 72)

Thus, what we should understand is that Stinchecum expanded the concept of *shutai* in a
way that would make it applicable to narrative discourse.

I will here try to clarify an apparent difference between Tokieda’s *shutai* and
Stinchecum’s “subject” that is the expansion of *shutai*. Tokieda, in applying his notion of
*shutai*, does not seem anywhere to take narrative into account, or things that belong to the
fictional world of a literary work. If that is the case, then Tokieda’s *shutai* does not
concern a character, a ‘subject’ of his/her utterances in the fictional world; it just refers to
author(s) or person(s) who create(s) the work in the real world.\(^{20}\) The following quote

\(^{20}\) This does not mean that Tokieda thought that the acting subject of a character’s
utterance corresponds to the author/creator of a work.
makes it clear how Tokieda thought of his concept of *shutai*, when he is talking about expression in general, verbal or non-verbal, literary and non-literary.

Not only in expression in language but also in expression in general, the *shutai* (author, creator, or composer if it is music) is usually a single individual. (Natsume) Sōseki in *Sanshirō* 三四郎, (Shiga) Naoya in *An'yakôro* あんやくろ, and others in architecture, painting, and sculpture, the *shutai* who creates his work is usually a single individual. In some cases, however, we can identify more than one *seisakusha* ‘creator(s)’ within a single work of expression. These cases can be classified into three types according to the relation between the participating *shutais*: (1) *dengon* ‘messages (delivered through a third party),’ (2) *in’yô/denbun* ‘citation and hearsay,’ (3) *gassaku* ‘collaboration.’ (1960, 93)

It is clear that neither Stinchecum’s ‘subject’ nor Tokieda’s *shutai* refers to the syntactic subject of grammar, but rather the agent that acts to form an expression in language. The difference, I would argue, is that the former includes subjects (characters and narrators) depicted by an author while the latter, as a matter of practice, actually focuses on author(s)/speaker(s) of an expression as a whole at the discourse (*bunshô/danwa*) level.²¹

²¹ Refer to Tokieda’s *Bunshô kenkyû josetsu* (1960, 93-172) for his extensive accounts on *shutai* of *bunshô*, including three types (*dengon*, *in’yô/denbun*, and *gassaku*) of multiple *shutais* within one *bunshô*. Stinchecum’s application of *shutai* belongs partly to the question of how the LAPT could handle attributed (e.g. quoted) language acts, and how it
Tokieda differentiates between a reported expression through a messenger in everyday linguistic communication and an utterance of a character reported by the author of a novel:

The complexity of a communicative structure that is mediated by a messenger likely follows from the fact that both the messenger and the original author of the message speak to the same person, i.e., their listener; the person who is the listener to the messenger is at the same time the listener to the author of the message. In novels, too, the words of third-party characters are quoted in the form of conversation. However, between those expressive subjects and the readers of the novel, the words related never constitute a speaker-listener relationship. (1960, 98-99)

The above quote shows that Tokieda focuses on the aspect of shutai as the participating creator(s) of an expression, who form(s) a speaker-listener relation with their recipient(s) of the expression. Given this aspect of shutai, Tokieda tries to theorize various written communications between such expressive shutai of a work and her reader:

... Written language, i.e., expression in bunshô, makes it possible to communicate not only with one specific person, but with the general public, ... one writes a letter to a specific individual while a novel, essay, document, and the like are written to the general public. In this way, we can set a standard of classifying bunshô based on to whom it is written. (1960, 177-178)

would define concepts such as text/work, narrative/narrator, voice, and point of view. Further examination of this question belongs to my future study.
The social nature of literature should not be understood as to how an author describes in her work, or has her work reflect, a society, but as how the author and a reader can be connected (through her work). ... Literary works as linguistic expression ... are unique in that they can form functional relations with various aspects of human life as people read and understand them. (1955, 152)

Also to be noted concerning Stinchecum’s “subject” and shutai is that when Stinchecum talks about “subjectivity,” we need to be careful not to understand it as the exact counterpart of what Tokieda calls shutaiteki na mono 主体的なもの, ‘things pertaining to shutai.’ Stinchecum’s “subjectivity” can refer to that of a character being described in a fictional work; Stinchecum (1985) says, “the subjectivity of a character is most firmly established in passages of interior monologues” (p. 72). Tokieda’s shutaiteki na mono, on the other hand, concerns that of author(s), or creator(s) of a work. Tokieda argues that an author’s subjectivity is to be conveyed through his/her intention, or
purpose, that becomes a basis of, as well as constraint on, his/her expression (1952, 74).\textsuperscript{22}

In other words, everything expressed in a literary work, including characters, their thoughts and emotions, and events, is objectified material, i.e. \textit{sozai}; and how a \textit{shutai} deals with those materials, as well as the very fact that the \textit{shutai} has chosen those materials, reveals the subjectivity of the \textit{shutai}, who is the author of a work. This subjectivity of the authorial \textit{shutai} is also used to explain communication between the author of a literary work and her reader:

\begin{quote}
What connects people in language is subjective things, or things pertaining to \textit{shutai} (\textit{shutaiteki na mono}), that are expressed through language. ... the objective things in literature, things pertaining to \textit{sozai} (\textit{kyakutaiteki na mono}), are characters depicted, their behavior, events, and/or nature. Subjective things are what is expressed in how an author handles those characters, events, and nature. Furthermore, it can be said that the fact that the author selected such characters, events, and nature represents her subjectivity. While we are absorbed in objective things such as characters, events, and nature, described in a work, we still, unconsciously, respond to the author’s subjectivity. (1955, 154)
\end{quote}

It is also important for us to note that the LAPT focuses on \textit{shutai} as the creator/author of a work as a whole so that it offers a theoretical basis for analyzing the communicative, social aspect of written discourse including literary works. Stinchecum’s expansion of

\textsuperscript{22} The original Japanese reads “思想感情の表現を支へ、これを規制するやうな話手の意識”
shutai, by contrast, deals with the crucial issue of how a reader appropriately identifies who is performing the specific language acts depicted within a work.

Now, let us look at how Stinchecum describes another important element of the LAPT’s triadic preconditions, bamen. As I briefly introduced it earlier, bamen, along with shutai and sozai, is one of the fundamental conditions that realize the linguistic process of expression and understanding. It represents things captured by shutai’s mental action as well as his/her mental state toward those things.\(^{23}\) If shutai is having a conversation with somebody, then the most salient component of bamen for that shutai should naturally be its listener.\(^{24}\) Stinchecum’s mention of bamen in the following quote illustrates how she understands the concept.

...; the narrator is not simply a disembodied voice—the subject of a given utterance—but a voice that implies a certain rhetorical attitude toward the narration itself, and beyond that, a particular grammatical relation to the object of narration and to the recipient of the narrative. Hence the narrator speaks within the conditions of a certain linguistic situation (ba or bamen). This linguistic situation—the speech act, or paradigm of linguistic performance—is defined by Tokieda Motoki as a triangular relationship: a speaker, a topic, and a situation or listener (recipient). (Stinchecum, 9)

There are two things in the above description that warrant comment. First, what Stinchecum calls “narrator” does not exactly match Tokieda’s shutai, since Tokieda primarily discusses “shutai” as the author of a literary work, and not just its narrator(s),

\(^{23}\) Tokieda’s original Japanese expression reads, “事物情景に志向する主体の態度、気分、感情” (2007a, 60).

\(^{24}\) Bamen can simply be understood as “situation” or “context” only when these terms are used in relation to shutai’s subjective standpoint.
or the non-authorial side of the hybrid *shutai* that he acknowledges do exist (see above). 25

Second, Stinchecum’s description of *bamen* is not exactly the same as what Tokieda explains in his writings. The above quoted description leads one to understand the concept of *bamen* as “linguistic situation,” which is at the same time, in Stinchecum’s statement here, the “speech act, or paradigm of linguistic performance.” In addition, what we should understand from the LAPT’s principles is that *bamen* is actually one of the elements that constitute what Stinchecum calls the “triangular relationship.” The two other elements are *shutai* (speaker, listener, writer, or reader) and *sozai* (what is expressed).

Another example of Stinchecum’s use of the notion of *bamen* will further clarify the difference between Tokieda’s *bamen* and Stinchecum’s understanding of it.

The linguistic situation (*bamen*) in Japanese has been discussed at length by Tokieda. The influence of the reporting speaker on what appears to be direct quotation and the ease with which descriptive narration blends into interior monologue in classical Japanese prose indicate the force of the linguistic situation and the difficulty in speaking from a position outside of it in Japanese. (Stinchecum, 9)

We have to note that the LAPT’s concept of *bamen* is one of the necessary conditions for language action in general. Therefore, in the LAPT’s term, it is more accurate to say that one can never speak without *bamen* regardless of whatever language she speaks.

---

25 “There should be no difficulty in accepting the premise that the narrator of a work of fiction is not the same as the historical personage who produced the work” (Stinchecum, 5). What I suggest here is not that the LAPT does not recognize the difference between the narrator of a work and the historical author, but that it could explain these notions somehow differently. This is another topic for future study.
We have seen how Tokieda’s *bamen* and *shutai* were understood and incorporated into Stinchecum’s discussion of narrative voice. We can summarize the issues as follows.

1. The LAPT focuses primarily on *shutai* of literary works as the creator of a work as a whole rather than as the performing subject(s) of individual language acts depicted within the work while Stinchecum’s “subject” expanded the concept to include the latter.\(^{26}\)

2. *Bamen* in the LAPT is just one of the conditions, along with *shutai* and *sozai*, that are necessary for language action to occur in the real world unlike Stinchecum’s “linguistic situation (*ba* or *bamen*),” which is defined by “a triangular relationship: a speaker, a topic, and a situation or a listener (recipient)” (Stinchecum, 9).

Thus, we have seen how Stinchecum interpreted, and in the case of *bamen*, somewhat misinterpreted, Tokieda’s ideas and how she applied those ideas to her discussion of the narrative and the narrative voice. There underlies, after all, a more essential and complicated issue in the treatment of Tokieda’s theory: the issue of the very view of language and its relationship with literary expression.

First, let us look at how Stinchecum understood Tokieda’s view, or definition, of language.

Tokieda first introduces the idea of subjectivity in his major work, *Kokugogaku genron* (“Principles of the Japanese Language”), by describing language itself as the subjective activity of the subject. (Stinchecum, 71)

\(^{26}\) As I suggested in footnotes #21, there remains a question of how the LAPT explains the difference between acting subject(s) of the whole of an expression (*bunshô/danwa*, or work) and acting subject(s) embedded inside that expression in relation to the different modes of language action, i.e. action of writing and that of reading, more precisely, a reader’s construal of written text, how a writer communicates through her work with readers of the text, etc.
The quotation above succinctly describes Tokieda’s definition of language. The crucial part in this definition is that “language itself” is “the subjective activity.” Stinchecum however did not strictly follow this view; instead, she treated language as a “medium” when she talks about literary “text” as opposed to literary “work” (Stinchecum, 4). According to her differentiation between work and text, “language” is to be made use of by a “speaker of the text or narrator.” This difference with the LAPT will be made clear by comparing the following charts; Chart 1 is extracted from Stinchecum (1985, 4), and Chart 2 is created by the present author, based on the LAPT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>text</td>
<td>speaker of the text;</td>
<td>language</td>
<td>grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>narrator</td>
<td></td>
<td>syntax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>diction (... etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td>author</td>
<td>concepts</td>
<td>theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>motif</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>plot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1. Elements of literary expression (Stinchecum)
Thus, although Stinchecum correctly described Tokieda’s definition of language, she did not apply it in her definition of the (literary) text and its relationship with “subject,” “medium,” and “components.”

Stinchecum’s treatment of literary text, or work, and Tokieda’s treatment of it are also essentially different. Stinchecum considers “language” as distinct from “text/work” that it enables, while Tokieda considers the work itself as a unit of (written) language. Although Tokieda did not include the concept of narrative in his linguistic investigations, the LAPT might have defined the concept of narrative in a way that is considerably differently from Stinchecum’s treatment of it. Let us look at how Stinchecum (1985) describes “the literary text” and “the work”:

The literary text is essentially a sequence composed of words, and when I speak of textual analysis I refer to aspects of the language that constitutes the text: grammar, syntax, style, diction, imagery, and the broader structures based on these. (Stinchecum, 4)

The work, on the other hand, and its corresponding activity of interpretation, represent a different level or dimension of activity on the part of the reader. It is first of all a
unified whole with a theme, comprised of motifs, characters, and plots, concerning which we can talk about intention, authorship, and context. (Stinchecum, 4)

In the LAPT, where language is viewed as action of expression and understanding, an individual literary work, or text, should only be defined either as a product of the action of expression or an object of the reading activity. The LAPT does not differentiate the (literary) text from the work.

1.3.3. Summary of comments

We have to conclude here from our reviews of Bedell (1968) and Stinchecum (1985) that they do not suffice (and were not intended to suffice) as presentations of the full scope of the LAPT’s theoretical implications, and in some respects may lead to the misapplication of its fundamental ideas. The issues that I have identified can be summarized as follows:

(1) The lack of a comprehensive study of Tokieda’s theory per se with considerations of its formation in its historical contexts
(2) The need for clarifying the relationship between ‘grammar’ and ‘language’ in the LAPT
(3) The need for clarifying the LAPT’s notion of the triadic conditions (shutai, bamen, and sozai) of language
(4) The need for clarifying how the LAPT theorizes literature and literary texts/works

In the next chapter, I will describe the overall process in which Tokieda developed his theory of language, in hoping that the chapter somehow serves for us to better understand the fundamental ideas of the LAPT.
Chapter 2: Tokieda Motoki and the Development of his LAPT

In the previous chapter, I described the fundamental ideas of the LAPT and, through my reviews of Bedell’s and Stinchecum’s uses of certain features of the theory, suggested the difficulty of understanding Tokieda’s theory of language in its entirety. In this chapter, I will examine in some detail how Tokieda developed the ideas that constitute his theory of language, considering relevant biographical facts and historical situations.

The main resource for writing this chapter is Tokieda’s autobiographical book, Kokugogaku e no michi 国語学への道, ‘The path to kokugogaku,’ (hereafter, referred to as Michi), where he recollected various events with regards to his intellectual life; this book after all is the single most credible source in understanding how his theory of language evolved over his lifetime.27

Section 2.1 briefly introduces general biographical facts about Tokieda. From Section 2.2 on, I will focus on how he developed his view of language and built a systematic theory based on it. Section 2.2 looks at Tokieda’s early childhood and discusses issues regarding how Tokieda became interested in language and what motivated him to study

27 The first edition of the book, Kokugo kenkyûhô 国語研究法, was published in 1947, which was actually a revised version of an unpublished manuscript written in 1944. The second edition, renamed to Kokugogaku e no michi, was published in 1957. The book I referred to, was published posthumously in 1976 with a few corrections and additions based on the author’s own notes on the second edition’s manuscript.
language. Section 2.3 will describe how his view of language took shape after entering Tokyo Imperial University, focusing especially on his 1924 graduation thesis. Section 2.4 describes the developmental process whereby Tokieda gained insights from the traditional Japanese linguistics and Husserl’s phenomenology, and organized a variety of his own ideas into a single work, *Genron*, in 1941. In the last section, I will briefly look at how Tokieda expanded the framework of *Genron* and presented a different organization that deals with a wide range of language phenomena, from basic communication in language to literature.

**2.1. An introduction to Tokieda Motoki (1900-1967)**

In this section, I will briefly introduce the intellectual life of the Japanese linguist, Tokieda Motoki 時枝誠記 (1900-1967), who established the LAPT. A rationale for providing a biographical sketch here in relation to Tokieda’s intellectual development is that taking a closer look at the inventor’s life should contribute to a deeper understanding of the theory, particularly its provenances. After all, theory is a product of human thinking. Knowing more about the life of an individual should help understand his/her way of thinking and how it changed and developed over the course of his/her lifetime.

Before going into Tokieda’s life, it is worth repeating his generally acknowledged position in the history of the study of (the Japanese) language in Japan. As mentioned earlier (see footnotes #2 on p. 8), Tokieda has been widely acknowledged and discussed as one of the most influential modern grammarians of the Japanese language, but his
theory of language in its entirety seems to have been less influential. Thus, within Japanese academia, the LAPT has not been as influential a guiding theory of language as have theories based on Western linguistics. Analyzing reasons for this in detail is not my objective here, nor could it be managed within the scope of the present study. I will only suggest three possible reasons that might help explain the situation. First, Tokieda based his ideas on language almost exclusively on the examination of the Japanese language; in fact, most of his crucial academic works on his theory of language appeared in the traditional field of *kokugogaku* 国語学, ‘the study of the national language,’ rather than *gengogaku* 言語学, ‘linguistics.’ Second, ever since the Meiji Restoration in the mid- to late nineteenth century, the general academic trend and atmosphere has been so influenced and guided by modern Western linguistics that it might have created a tendency to think any theory that was critical of and radically different from certain assumptions of Western linguistics was dubious, nonstandard, or at worst unscientific. The last possible reason is related to the difficulty in understanding the LAPT per se. As my review of Bedell and Stinchecum—two works that dealt with selected features of the LAPT—in Section 1.1.2 shows, the radical ideas of the theory could easily prevent one

---

28 As long as I know, no introductory Japanese linguistic books, not to mention *gengogaku* 言語学 as practiced in Japan adopted the full theoretical framework of the LAPT as it was elaborated in Tokieda’s *Kokugogaku genron zokuhen* 国語学原論続篇 (1955); if one adopts the LAPT’s theoretical framework, topics such as communication in language (*dentatsu* 伝達), functions of language (*gengo no kinō* 言語の機能), the social nature of language (*gengo no shakaisei* 言語の社会性), language life (*gengo seikatsu* 言語生活), and literature as language (*gengo to shite no bungaku* 言語としての文学), should be treated as core subjects, not merely as additions to the traditional subjects such as phonetics/phonology, morphosyntax, semantics and pragmatics.
from understanding what Tokieda really tried to explain about language and how the LAPT is essentially different from many theories in Western linguistics.

Tokieda was born in 1900, five years after the end of the First Sino-Japanese War and four years before the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War. The political atmosphere surrounding Japan in the early twentieth century significantly, directly or indirectly, affected Tokieda’s interest in the Japanese language. The emerging nationalistic fervor among people of Japan since the Meiji Restoration (around 1867) saw its peak after the country won these two wars in a relatively short period of time around the turn of the century. This trend brought about issues of the national language at a political level. There was urgent sense of need among politicians and intellectuals to establish and promote the standard language (hyōjungo 標準語), and to reform the writing system (kokuji kairyō mondai 国字改良問題). The Michi tells us that there were two major factors that made Tokieda interested in issues of the Japanese language, both of them associated with the nationalistic enthusiasm of the time; one was his father’s interest in the issue of reforming Japanese writing system, and the other was a passionate essay on the ‘national language’ written by Ueda Kazutoshi 上田万年 (1867-1937), a founding father of kokugogaku (Section 2.2).

After entering the nation’s top academic institution, Tokyo Teikoku Daigaku 東京帝国大学 ‘Tokyo Imperial University,’ Tokieda studied kokugogaku under Ueda Kazutoshi and Hashimoto Shinkichi 橋本進吉 (1982-1945). What is remarkable regarding his academic life is that Tokieda’s research attitude and objective persisted with striking
consistency from this time forward, throughout his career. From the time he first presented his own view of language in his graduation thesis, Tokieda literally devoted almost all of his subsequent works to the development, elaboration, and application of that view. Although the main contents of his graduation thesis focused on the development of Japanese intellectuals’ awareness of their own language, his ultimate research question is, “What is language?” or “What is it that we call language?” With this primary question in his mind, he organized his own historical account of how Japanese intellectuals viewed and conceptualized “language” as they themselves studied and criticized their predecessors’ ideas. In this research, Tokieda tried to gain insights that would substantiate his own language view in the history of 

After graduating from Tokyo Imperial University, Tokieda taught Japanese language at chûgakkô 中学校 (a pre-collegiate school, unlike today’s chûgakkô) in Tokyo for a short period of time before he moved to Seoul, Korea (called Keijô 京城 during the Japanese colonization) in 1927 to become an assistant professor of kokugogaku. It was during this period that he developed the foundations of the LAPT and eventually integrated those into Genron, which appeared in 1941. Despite Tokieda’s radical view of language and his severe criticism of the Saussurean theory of language, Genron did not receive much critical attention from academics until after the end of World War II.

29 See Section 2.3.2 for a detailed discussion of Tokieda’s graduation thesis.
30 The original Japanese expressions read, respectively, “言語トハ何ヲヤ?” and “如何ナルモノヲ我々言語ト命名シテ居ルカ？” (1976a, 6).
31 A detailed biographical timeline for Tokieda is available in Suzuki (1997).
In 1943, Tokieda returned to Japan to become a professor of *kokugogaku* at Tokyo Imperial University, succeeding Hashimoto Shinkichi, whose predecessor had been Ueda Kazutoshi. In the same year, he was awarded a doctoral degree (*bungaku hakushi* 文学博士) by the same university, recognizing *Genron* as his doctoral dissertation. After the end of WW II, he began to expand the horizon of the LAPT’s theoretical framework to include a theory of language communication, the social nature of language, functions of language, a theory of language life, and a theory of literature, all based on his processual view of language. Tokieda also served as a board member of the National Institute for Japanese Language and Linguistics (Kokuritsu Kokugo Kenkyûjo 国立国語研究所) and a member of Kokugo Shingi Kai 国語審議会, ‘National Language Council,’ from the late 1940s. Throughout his career after the war, he was actively engaged with the issues of language policy and language education from his academic standpoint. In treating those issues, Tokieda never failed to base his arguments on his theory. The practical orientation of his study during this period led to his publishing three grammar books, *Nihon bunpô kôgo hen* 日本文法口語篇, ‘*The Spoken Japanese Grammar*’ (1950), *Nihon bunpô bungo hen* 日本文法文語篇, ‘*The Written Japanese Grammar*’ (1954), and *Bunshô kenkyû josetsu* 文章研究序説 (1960) ‘*Prolegomenon to the Study of Discourse,*’ which

---

32 *Bunshô kenkyû josetsu* should be, in a strict sense, characterized as ‘Starting principles in the study of bunshô.’ However, since one of the unique contributions of Tokieda grammar lies in positing bunshô (roughly identical to what linguists call ‘discourse’) as the most concrete unit of language (and instantiation of grammar in use), I have considered this work as related to his other ‘purely’ grammatical works.
have continued to be referenced by scholars who address aspects of Japanese grammar within the *kokugogaku* tradition.

Tokieda retired from Tokyo Imperial University in 1961, and immediately after that he took up a professorship in *kokugogaku* at Waseda University. Suzuki (1997) has introduced some of Tokieda’s unpublished notes, one of which describes two general goals in accepting the appointment at Waseda. I will here cite Tokieda’s own words, as quoted in Suzuki (1997, 215):

その一は、私の言語理論の最終段階である言語生活および言語生活の研究に、この十年間で何とか目鼻をつけたいと考えたこと。
その二は、私の言語理論である言語過程説による国語学の体系を、多くの方々に理解していただき、更に進んでそれに対する批判を開かしてもらう仕事をしたいこと。特に第二の私の希望は、私が早稲田に来た最大の意義であり、義務であると考えている。

The first of those is that I hope in the coming decade to somehow put the finishing touches on the notion of and my research into, language life, as the final stage in my theory of language. The second is that I hope many people to understand the system of *kokugogaku* based on *gengo katei setsu*, my theory of language; and furthermore, I want them to let me hear their criticism of it. The second one should be of greatest significance to me, and my responsibility, now that I’ve come to Waseda.

Succeeding sections describe in detail how the LAPT emerged and developed within its inventor’s intellectual activities, taking into account external facts that are assumed to help form the theory. For the purpose of convenience, I have divided the rest of this chapter into five sections according to Tokieda’s academic career; Section 2 is about his early childhood; Section 3, the period of the student at Tokyo Imperial University and the middle school teacher of *Kokugo* in Tokyo (1922-1927); Section 4, the period of the
faculty member at Keijō Imperial University (1927-1943); Section 5, the period of the professor at Tokyo Imperial University until his death (1943-1967).

2.2. The early development of Tokieda’s interest in language

2.2.1. Influence of his father: fostering an interest in language

In Michi, Tokieda describes his early childhood and how his father helped Tokieda become interested in language. The most important influence from his father among others would have been the interest in practical language problems, such as the reform of written Japanese, but let us first take a look at what kind of person Tokieda thought his father was.

His father, Tokieda Motoyuki 時枝誠之 (1870-1934) was a bank officer, who worked for most of his son’s childhood at overseas branches in such places as India and the United States. Tokieda recollects in Michi that Motoyuki was an unusually widely-read person for a bank employee and he was no match for his father in that respect (1976a, 8).33 This might explain somehow the theoretical inclination seen in the LAPT, which is open-ended in nature and inclusive rather than exclusive; it starts from a simple definition of language and develops from there to explain a wide variety of language phenomena including even literature in relation to various activities of human life.

33 A related story is reported in a Tokieda’s biography written by one of his students, Suzuki Kazuhiko 鈴木一彦 (1923-2000). Suzuki recalls that Tokieda once told him, when he was engaged in a project on language life (gengo seikatsu 言語生活) in around 1962, how he had come to feel the need for shifting his research style to be more knowledge-based from thinking-based and considering the fact that his father had been such a knowledgeable man, the shift would not be impossible for him either (1997, 211).
Motoyuki impressed his son with his enthusiastic interest in Japanese language reform in the early 1910s. Let us look at the description that vividly relates the situation:

In order to support his idea of Japanese language reform, he read popular linguistics books and went on further to study languages such as Sanskrit and Arabic; he would amaze me, proudly relating his wide-ranging knowledge. He lived his life in the atmosphere of the new open society of the Meiji period and fully experienced an American life with its rationalistic, opportunistic, and materialistic aspects; the idea of reforming Japanese that all this informed influenced me imperceptibly but so much that I would ardently teach myself to use a typewriter and type out roman letters, and on another occasion, be scolded by my middle school teacher of Kokugo because I turned in a composition written most in kana. (1976a, 9-10)

There is no doubt that his father’s enthusiasm contributed to directing young Tokieda’s attention to language per se, and practical issues surrounding the Japanese language in the atmosphere of the thriving nationalism of that time.\(^{34}\) It would not be an overstatement to say that the practical nature of the LAPT had its origin partly in his father’s enthusiasm for Japanese language reform.

Motoyuki’s idea of language reform was quite simple, according to Tokieda; he classified the Japanese words into two types, one for its physical elements, and the other its psychological element. With this classification, Motoyuki argued that a new Japanese

\(^{34}\) After the Meiji Restoration, Japanese intellectuals began to realize the need to modernize the Japanese language. Major issues discussed since then include standardization of both the spoken and written Japanese, and how to improve Japanese orthography, i.e., script reform.
language (neo-Japaniizu ネオ・ジャパニーズ) should be invented by replacing Sino-Japanese lexical items (kango 漢語) with English ones. An example of Motoyuki’s neo-Japanese reads as follows:

Wazuka twenty years ago, Constitutional Government no moto ni, first Diet ga hirakareta toki, prince Ito ga kare no “Commentaries on Constitution” ni Ministers wa directly niwa Emperor ni mata indirectly niwa people ni “responsible de aru”; mata “Ministers no responsibility wo decide suru power wa Diet kara withheld sarete aru” to iishi koto wa generally ni acknowledge sareta. (Cited in 1976a, 11)

The content of his father’s idea of the reform itself did not impress young Tokieda but made him think seriously about the future of his mother tongue (1976a, 13). The point here however is the physical-psychological classification made by Motoyuki. Although Tokieda does not mention how he thought about Motoyuki’s classification of Japanese lexicons into two elements, it is worth pointing out that this classification will remind anyone familiar with the so-called Tokieda grammar’s classification of Japanese words into shi 詞 and ji 詞. Roughly put, shi expresses concepts while ji represents a subjective cognitive attitude toward or judgment of such concepts. There is no decisive evidence that clearly shows his father’s idea partly contributed to forming Tokieda’s central grammatical conception, yet it is worth noting here as one plausible possibility.

2.2.2. Influence of Ueda Kazutoshi

Tokieda recalled in Michi that it was Ueda Kazutoshi 上田万年 (1967-1937) who motivated him to pursue a career as a scholar of Japanese language. When he was in his late teens, he became more and more skeptical about his father’s idea of Japanese
language reform and in turn his interest in his native tongue grew. It was at around that
time when Tokieda read Ueda’s passionate essay on the study of Japanese language.\textsuperscript{35}

From today’s perspective, Ueda’s essay might sound disturbingly nationalistic, but
Tokieda candidly described the excitement that he experienced in reading Ueda’s emotional statement on the importance of caring for the national language (1976a, 13-16).\textsuperscript{36} Although Ueda’s nationalistic enthusiasm played a decisive role in Tokieda’s deciding to become a scholar of the Japanese language (1976a, 15-16), I would also point out that Ueda’s view of language might well have served as a resource for Tokieda in developing his own view of language. Ueda’s essay includes the following passage, which states his view of language:

Between a language that a person speaks and the character of that person, one can see the most complex relationship; everything that person thinks and feels about a thing or even is reflected in his/her language. Therefore, I do not hesitate to regard language to

\textsuperscript{35} According to the description in \textit{Kokugogaku e no michi}, it would most likely be \textit{Chyûgaku kokugo tokuhon 中学国語読本}, a government-designated Japanese language textbook used in middle schools at that time, in which Ueda’s essay, \textit{Kokugo to kokka to 國語と國家と ‘the national language and the nation’} would have been included. The essay had been published as part of the book \textit{Kokugo no tame 國語のため ‘For kokugo’} published in 1895. Since I have not been able to actually refer to the textbook, I am unable to confirm at this moment whether it includes the entire essay or only a part of it.

\textsuperscript{36} This notion of \textit{kokugo} as a native tongue later became Tokieda’s concern and eventually he rejected it because of its inappropriateness for the colonial situation in Korea.
be medium in which the feelings or thoughts active in one’s mental state are externalized. Given this view, though I would not dare to say that language is thought as Max Müller did, I would not object to saying that language is formed thought. (1895, 11)

Tokieda had maintained that his view of language had been inspired by traditional studies of the Japanese language before the Meiji period (1968, 6; 2007a, 9-8). However, there should have been some other, prior views that motivated Tokieda to inquire into such fundamental questions as he did, in the first place. I would suggest the possibility that such view of language as described in Ueda’s Kokugo no tame preconditioned, in one way or another, Tokieda’s inquiry into the essence of language. One important point in this respect is that Ueda’s view is hardly a processual one, given his description of language as ‘an externalized entity’ (「外に出して化したるものの」).

Also to be noted in relation to Ueda’s influence is the fact that his attitude toward the study of the Japanese language was always related to practical issues such as political matters (i.e., inventing hyójungo 標準語 ‘standardized language,’ restricting Chinese characters and Chinese-originated words, etc.) and language education (kokugo kyōiku 国語教育). As we shall see in the following sections, Tokieda had always been interested in and motivated by those practical issues as he worked to base his arguments on a view of language of his own.
2.3. Forming a processual view of language

In this section, I will deal with the period during which Tokieda was a student at Tokyo Imperial University, majoring in kokugogaku and the few years he spent teaching after graduation. Up until this section, we have only talked about facts that led Tokieda to the study of language. This period is crucial, however, in that we can examine his first academic work, which is a graduation thesis. What makes his graduation thesis so crucial is the fact that in its first chapter, Tokieda makes mention of his idea that language is a process, if only briefly.

While Tokieda’s graduation thesis will be our central focus, we will be also looking at two other points from this period. First, it is important to know how Tokieda approached the study of language and what ideas and theories of language he made himself familiar with. This will help us understand what led him to hold a processual view of language. Second, his teaching experience should also be taken into consideration, because his LAPT was organized so that one could apply it to issues of language education. In fact, after the Second World War, Tokieda himself actively engaged in theorizing the language education in Japan.

2.3.1. Studying at Tokyo Imperial University

In order to grasp how Tokieda approached the study of language, it will be best to refer to his own recollection. In Michi, Tokieda describes what he really wanted to study in the field of kokugogaku, and how.
At that time, I desired to pin down the essence of what the study called kokugogaku is really about by reading books of philosophy, ethics, psychology, and such, rather than to collect data of the Japanese language from old materials in a research office. (1976a, 22)

Tokieda also named courses he took at Tokyo Imperial University: the study of religion taught by Anezaki Masaharu 姉崎正治 (1973-1949), ethnic psychology by Kuwata Yoshizō 桑田芳蔵 (1882-1967), who had studied under Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), and anthropology, taught by Torii Ryûzô 鳥居龍蔵 (1870-1953).

If we characterize research along a continuum with a fact-oriented, bottom-to-top approach at one pole, with a theory-oriented, top-to-bottom approach at the other, Tokieda may well tend toward the latter, but in seeking a reason for this, should consider the historical context. Tokieda recollects a tendency of kokugogaku at that time to demand knowledge of other fields of study.

Those who read books of kokugogaku at that time must have noticed how these books emphasized related fields or complementary fields of study for the study of language. This must have been motivated in part by our predecessors’ concern to provide kokugogaku, which lacked scientific characteristics, with the basics of modern scholarship. All I did was take that as I found it. Then I tried hard to rethink problems.
by drawing them down to the level of self-evident truths, as a starting point. (1976a, 22-23)

Since the Meiji Restoration in the second half of the 19th century, Japanese intellectuals struggled to change, re-organize or rebuild traditional things into something that could match modern Western counterparts. The study of the Japanese language was no exception. Ueda Kazutoshi was one of those intellectuals, who, out of his own patriotic motivation, tried hard to establish a foundation for the study of Japanese language from a perspective of Western linguistic standards at that time. As a result, in the early 1920s, almost all professors and senior students of kokugogaku at Tokyo Imperial University were under the strong influence of Western linguistics at that time. The list of books below shows what kind of Western linguistic thoughts in the late 19th century were available to the public in Japan at that time.37

*Hikaku hakugengaku* 比較博言學 (1890) by Okakura Yoshizaburō 岡倉由三郎 (1868-1936):

*Kotoba no inochi* ことばのいのち (1897) by Kanazawa Shôzaburô 金沢庄三郎 (1872-1967): A translation of *Life of Words* (1886) or *La Vie des mots: Etudiee dans leur significations* (1887) by Arsène Darmesteter (1846–1888)

*Gengogaku* 言語學 (1898) by Ueda Kazutoshi and Kanazawa Shôzaburô: A translation of *Principles of Comparative Philology* (1874) by Archibald Henry Sayce (1846-1933)

---

37 The list was compiled based on the information in Tokieda’s book, *Gendai no kokugogaku* 現代の国語学, ‘Modern Japanese Linguistics’ (1956a). The information can be found in the section, *Gengogaku no honyaku to shôkai* 言語学の翻訳と紹介, ‘Translating and introducing (works of the Western) linguistics’ (20-21).
Since I could not find any direct record that tells us exactly which of the above-listed books Tokieda might have actually read, it is hard to know exactly how much he familiarized himself with such ideas and views of language as were manifested in those books before he started writing his undergraduate thesis. Some helpful hints, however, may perhaps be gleaned by turning to what Ueda had to say about Western linguistics around that time. Tokieda recollected in Michi that Ueda told his students in his lectures what kokugogaku was really about and about its relation to Western linguistics, as well as the importance of getting insights from other fields of study, such as anthropology, physiology, acoustics, psychology, and so forth. Thus, it is certain that through Ueda, Tokieda gained some awareness of Western linguistics and how it construed language. Ueda published a book called Kokugogaku no jukkô 國語學の十講 “Ten lectures in
kokugogaku’ in 1916. Let us look at what he says in the book about the definition and fundamental characteristics of language.

Linguists give the following definition: “Language is a thing in which thought is expressed in a logical and analytical way by using segmental sounds of the human voice.”

So, the characteristics of human language are that (1) it uses vocal sounds; (2) it is perceived by ears and this means (3) it is temporal unlike sculptures, paintings, letters/characters and such; and (4) it is the expression of one’s thought in segmentable elements. ... but in addition to these, what one should not forget in considering and discussing language is the fact that it is a thing that is man-made and a kind of agreement between people. (1916, 32)

The above quote indicates that Ueda advocated the definition of language that focuses on speech and dismisses the role of characters/letters in the action of reading. In the following passages from the same book, Ueda expressed his disappointment that unlike its Western counterpart, the traditional kokugogaku did not investigate much about historical and dialectal aspects of the spoken language.

As for the Japanese language, we unfortunately still lack such detailed works on the history of languages as we can see for English, German, French, Italian, and classical languages such as Greek and Latin. (1916, 3)
What those scholars of the time took as material for their research was limited to the language written as waka poetry in the Nara or Heian period. In general, they thought that the language that can be seen in Heian literature was the language of a golden age, and it fell into disorder as time went by. That is why they did not care about dynamic aspects of language such as the life and death of language, language change, dialectal variation, and so forth. This tendency long influenced scholarly organizations for the study of the Japanese language in the Meiji period. Even today in Taisho times, the living language has yet to garner people's serious attention, sympathy, protection, or encouragement. (1916, 4-5)

Yamada Yoshio is another important figure in relation to defining language, which Tokieda would have familiarized himself with. According to Michi, Tokieda attended weekly reading sessions in Ueda’s office under the supervision of Hashimoto Shinkichi and Kindaichi Kyōsuke 田中一雄助 (1882-1971), where they read Yamada’s Nihon bunpō kōgi 日本文法講義 (1922), a newly published, massive book about Japanese grammar (1976a, 20). At the very beginning of the first chapter of the book, Yamada describes what language and its study are.
The thing in which one’s thought is expressed by the sounds of the human voice is called language (gengo); when language is written in letters/characters, we call it bunshô.

Generally speaking, what we call language has thought as its content and vocal sounds as its external form. Therefore, it should be self-evident that the study of language must exist separate from those of thought or sound. Although the study of language is not the same as those of thought or sound, one should not forget the fact that there is an intimate relation between them. For the study of thought, there are psychology and logic; for the study of vocal sounds, there are acoustics and a portion of physiology. For the study of language, there is linguistics. (1922, 1)

Yamada’s definition of language is quite similar to Ueda’s in that it focuses on the spoken language. Yamada is clearer in stating language consists of thoughts and vocal sounds. Like many other scholars of language in Japan, Yamada emphasized the need to be aware of the importance of other fields of study that were relevant to linguistics. He does not explicate, however, exactly what the true object of linguistic research is, if language is just thought and vocal sounds. It was this kind of question that Tokieda raised in his graduation thesis.

In concluding this section, let us turn back again to Michi for Tokieda’s own explanation of how he started to become so interested in the question of what language is.
thoroughly impartial attitude toward linguistic research, unconsciously held a presupposed view of language, i.e., that it was an amalgam of sound and meaning. (1976a, 89)

2.3.2. Tokieda’s graduation thesis

Tokieda completed his graduation thesis by early 1925. The title is *Nihon ni okeru gengo kannen no hattatsu oyobi gengo kenkyū no mokuteki to sono hôhô (Meiji izen)* (「日本ニ於ケル言語観念ノ発達及言語研究ノ目的ト其ノ方法（明治以前）」), ‘The development of language awareness in Japan, and objectives and methods of the study of language in Japan (before the Meiji period).’ In short, it is a history of the study of Japanese language in Japan, but with a very specific approach and attitude in examining the historical facts. What he wanted to reveal from those historical facts was a set of views of language, which he believed was implicit in how past scholars treated issues concerning language. His ultimate objective however was not in the historical development of language views per se, but in establishing his own view of language and, thereby, his own theory of language, which he felt demanded a clear object and a methodology of the study. The relation between the contents of his graduation thesis and his ultimate purpose of the study is described in Chapter one of the thesis. Let us look at the master plan of his research project described in the first chapter.

In the very beginning of the chapter, he tells us that his thesis constitutes only one part of three, due to time constraints. The main part of those three is about principles of the study of the Japanese language, including the object and methodology of the study.
Before he describes his concrete plan, he talks about what led him to tackle such an ambitious goal.

When I try to delve into various research subjects within the study of the Japanese language, such as problems in philology, phonology, grammar, linguistic sound, orthography, relations between language and thought, dialects, and the historical change of language, there emerges a problem that demands solving before any of these, the question “What is language?” Without solving this problem, I should not take even a step forward into any immediate issues of the study. (1976b, 2)

Tokieda goes on to present his own hypothetical view of language:

I defined language as an expressive type of action of humans, which is comparable to painting, music, dance, and so forth. Given that, I went on to hypothesize that one could truly understand the essence of language by considering what characteristics “language” (as such) has. (1976b, 6)

In another part of his thesis, Tokieda points out that the object of the study of language, as long as it is seen as a part of the science of human mind or human culture, seems far less clear than that of natural sciences (17). He goes on to say that linguists in general

---

38 Tokieda referred to Kagaku gairon 科学概論, ‘An Introduction to Science,’ (1922, 216), by philosopher Tanabe Hajime 田辺元 (1886-1962), in order to explain why the object of the study of natural sciences can be relatively easily posited for observation.
have yet to fully explicate what people usually mean by *gengo* 言語 ‘language’ (18).

Then he proposes his processual view of language as the very object of study:

> It seems to me that the essence of language would not be the sound, the written text (letters or characters), or thought, but means in which one expresses his/her thought in the sound or letters/characters. I would argue that the object of the study of language should indeed be such process. ... When linguists deal with the sound, it appears to us as if that sound per se is the object of their study, but this is not the case; (what they are actually dealing with) is a process in which one’s thought is expressed with the sound being its medium. (1976b, 18-19)

With this view of language as a postulate, Tokieda presents an outline of the main section of the larger project; translations follow the Japanese:

（目次甲）
一、言語表現ト其他ノ表現運動トノ関係
二、言語表現ノ本質
三、自然科学ト精神科学トニ對スル言語學ノ関係
四、言語學ノ基礎学
五、言語學ト國語學トノ関係
六、國語學ノ對象
七、國語學ノ研究法

Table of Contents A
1. The relation between language expression and other forms of expressive action

---

39 The hand-written text shows a piece of marginalia: “手続き、過程とすべきか,” roughly, “should this be *tetsuzuki* ‘procedure’ or *katei* ‘process’?”
Tokieda believed that he should examine, before moving on to the main section, how previous scholars viewed language, in order to put his own view of language on solid ground. For that reason, he offers additional topics to be explored:

Table of Contents B. The development of language views of scholars in Japan, their research methods and objectives

Table of Contents C. The development of language views of scholars in the West, their research methods and objectives

At this point, he clarifies that his thesis will focus on Content B and in the future he will move on to Content C, and finally to Contents A, the main part of the whole project. It is obvious that for Tokieda, his historical survey of past studies of language were nothing but supplementary in nature; that is why he limited the scope of his study and focused only on traditionally well-recognized scholars, a large proportion of those being so-called *kokugakusha* 国学者 from the Edo period (1603-1867), such as Keichû 契沖 (1640-1701), Motoori Norinaga 本居宣長 (1730-1801), Fujitani Nariakira 富士谷成章 (1738-
1779), Suzuki Akira 鈴木航 (1764-1837), Motoori Haruniwa 本居春庭 (1763-1828),
and Tōjō Gimon 東条義門 (1786-1843). Tokieda’s graduation thesis is crucial in
understanding the development of the LAPT, considering the fact that his processual
view of language was already explicitly stated there and that view remained the core of
the theory throughout his academic career.

During his period as a Tokyo Imperial University student, there was a particularly
important linguistic work that influenced the structuring of Tokieda’s graduation thesis;
namely, *Language; its Nature, Development and Origin* (1922) written by Danish
linguist Otto Jespersen (1869-1943).40 The following quote from Jespersen’s *Language*
shows similarity with how Tokieda positioned his historiography of *kokugogaku* within
his larger objective of studying about language:

> I have prefixed to the theoretical chapters of this work a short survey of the history of
the science of language in order to show how my problems have been previously
treated. (9)

However, *Language* influenced Tokieda in more ways than just its methodological
approach. First, Jespersen declares in the preface of the book that language “is nothing
but a function of certain living human beings,” and also it is “purposeful activity” (7). He
restates at the end of the same paragraph that the “act is individual, but the interpretation
presupposes that the individual forms part of a community with analogous habits, and a

---

40 In *Michi*, Tokieda mentions the influence of Jespersen’s work on his method of
establishing his own language view by revealing the historical development of language
views in the past (32-33).
language thus is seen to be one particular set of human customs of a well-defined social character” (8). Although Tokieda did not directly mention Jespersen’s influence either in his graduation thesis or in *Michi* in relation to a definition of language, it must have somehow impressed Tokieda, considering his later characterization of language as action of expression and understanding.

Two important points emerge when considering Jespersen’s influence on the development of the LAPT. The first point is related to Jespersen’s claim that linguists “have neglected all problems connected with a valuation of language” (99). This encouraged Tokieda’s later treatment of language problems, specifically language policy, along with his theorization of shutai’s expressive valuation of his/her language actions (*kachi ishiki* 価値意識) and the role of skill (*gijutsu* 技術) in language.\(^\text{41}\) The second point is the range of issues the two theories dealt with. Tokieda elaborated and developed his theory in order to include issues of communication, functional relationships between language life and other aspects of human life, and the theory of literature; Jespersen focused largely on the biological aspect of language change and language development by taking into account the child’s acquisition of language and the roles played by individuals.

\(^\text{41}\) When he was in Korea a few years after his graduation from Tokyo Imperial University, he had an opportunity to deliver a lecture on language policy in Japan, which was the first time he dealt with such a practical aspect of language. He says in *Kokugogaku e no michi* that this lecture was motivated by his discontent with the fact that the study of Japanese language at that time seemed to have nothing to say about what the language should be in the future, not the past; this discontent was particularly inspired by Jespersen’s statement, cited above (1976a, 45-46).
Tokieda wrote in *Michi* that it was around 1924 that he heard about Ferdinand de Saussure from Jinbô Kaku 神保格 (1883-1965), a Japanese linguist, and immediately ordered the masterpiece, *Cours de linguistique générale*. He studied the *Cours* in its original language until a Japanese translation by Kobayashi Hideo 小林英夫 was published in 1928, which allowed Tokieda to understand the book much more easily (Tokieda, 1976a, 90). Tokieda’s graduation thesis was written in around 1924 and by that time he already had a view of language as a kind of expressive action. In *Michi*, Tokieda recollected that his processual view of language (i.e., as dynamic action, not a static entity or a symbolic system) had not originated in being critical of Western linguistic thought, but was inspired by traditional studies of the Japanese language by Japanese scholars before the Meiji period (ibid.).

Hence, when we consider what role Saussure’s *Cours* played in developing the LAPT, we have to keep in mind that it was used mostly to delineate more clearly and effectively the processual view of language Tokieda held rather than to help form that view.

### 2.3.3. Tokieda’s experience in language education

Having the experience of teaching language is not necessarily relevant to developing a theory of language. Yet I believe that for a theoretical linguist such experiences would never be useless, but rather, depending on the individual’s will and effort, would enhance his/her theoretical view of language. One obvious reason is that it is the kind of work in

---

42 See Section 2.4.3, especially the footnotes #48, for more about how the traditional study of the Japanese language inspired Tokieda to establish the core of his theory of language.
which one will necessarily be aware of almost every aspect of language practice, from
how one acquires various aspects of language to how those aspects of language can be
analyzed and put in order so that one can effectively learn them. Indeed, one teaches
language in a way that necessarily makes assumptions about what language is, or should
be, for learners to learn it. It is for this reason that I introduce Tokieda’s experience in
language teaching as one of the important factors that contributed his development of the
LAPT.

Immediately after his graduation from Tokyo Imperial University, Tokieda was
employed as a teacher at a middle school located in Tokyo. This experience is described
in detail by Tokieda himself in *Michi*. The subject is of course *Kokugo*, ‘the national
language’, the name for Japanese as a school subject. Here, it will be best to introduce his
own words about why this experience was special to him:

それは、研究生活とは全く懸隔れた生活であったからという意味ではなく、
そこでは、国語が全く生きた切実な問題として与えられたからである。
It (that the experience of language teaching was a precious one) is not because that
(teaching language) was a totally different one from the academic life, but because
(the Japanese) language was presented to me as a living, serious issue. (1976a, 37)

In a more concrete way, this experience also provided Tokieda with the inspiration that
would later became one of the crucial ideas within the framework of the LAPT: the role
of interpretation as a crucial pre-condition that allows one, an observer of language, to
grasp language as an object of study (1976a, 38-39). The sources of that inspiration were
his two colleagues in the school, Kaitô Matsuzô 墩内松三 (1878-1952) and Nishio
Minoru 西尾実 (1889-1979). Both were alumni of Tokyo Imperial University and had continued studying language and literature education after graduating. The issue of interpretation provided other questions for Tokieda to tackle: what it is to ‘observe’ language phenomena and how different the standpoints of language performer and observer are. His answers to those questions were to be included later in Genron. Thus, the experience of teaching the native language to chūgakkō students enhanced the practical aspects of his LAPT.

2.4. Two works: Kokugogaku shi and Kokugogaku genron

Tokieda taught the Japanese language at the middle school in Tokyo for one and a half years. Then, he was appointed assistant professor of kokugogaku in Keijô Imperial University (京城帝国大学) in 1927 and moved to Korea. At the end of the same year, he went on a two-year study abroad trip to Europe and the U.S.A at the Japanese government’s expense. After coming back to Keijô and getting married in 1929, Tokieda resumed his project on the history of the Japanese linguistics in Japan. Along with that project, he focused on reading Genji monogatari (The Tale of Genji) in order to relate the process of interpreting classical texts to the study of language in general. As a result, in 1932, he published Kokugogaku shi, his first major work since his graduation thesis. The scholars and ideas treated in the new book remained almost the same as in his thesis, but

43 Both Kaitô and Nishio later became Tokieda’s object of criticism in different issues: with Nishio, about the concept of language life and the relation between language and literature (1947, 46-54; 1984, 240-262; 2008, 170-171), and with Kaitô, about how to study and teach “reading” (1965b, 1-14).
the approach he took changed; he focused more on the contexts in which those ideas were nurtured. One of the major contexts is philosophy, in this case, the practice of interpreting and annotating Japanese classical texts, such as *Kojiki* 古事記 and *Manyōshu* 万葉集 among others. Through his *Kokugogaku shi* project and his reading of *Genji*, Tokieda became increasingly aware of the role of understanding within language action (Tokieda, 1976a, 67-79). Even after the publication of *Kokugogaku shi* (1932a), Tokieda continued to develop his view of language, based on his findings in *Kokugogaku shi*, into a theory that could explain the essential characteristics of language. Along the way, some of the ideas of Husserl’s phenomenology introduced by Yamauchi Tokuryû 山内得立 (1890-1982) in his *Genshōgaku josetsu* 現象學序説 (1929) helped Tokieda understand language expression in terms of *shutai*, *sozai*, and *bamen* (see page 76 for more about the influence of phenomenology). From 1936 to 1940, Tokieda published a total of more than 20 papers that are closely related to exploring and defining the essence of language.

To finalize his project on the history of *kokugogaku*, he made changes and additions to the 1932 version, emphasizing that his theory of language had its basis in the pre-Meiji *kokugogaku* tradition. The revised edition of *Kokugogaku shi* was published at the end of 1940. Finally, in 1941, the general framework of the LAPT was presented for the first time in the book-length work, *Genron*.

---

44 Yamauchi was a Japanese philosopher, who studied at Kyoto Imperial University (京都帝国大學) under Nishida Kitarō 西田幾多郎 (1970-1945) and later at the University of Freiburg under Edmund Husserl (1859-1938).
This section examines three areas: (1) how the issue of language policy in Korea under Japanese colonial rule affected Tokieda’s definition of *kokugo* as an object of study, and his dealing with “the sense of value” in relation to the language problem; (2) how Tokieda’s study abroad experience led to his awareness of the fundamental difference between the Western linguistic tradition and its Japanese counterpart; (3) the process of how Tokieda developed the ideas that were eventually included in *Genron*, as his *Kokugogaku shi* project went on.

In order to clarify the process of forming the LAPT’s theoretical framework, let us note briefly the general structure of *Genron* before moving on to this chapter’s individual sections. *Genron* consists of two parts. Part I is a general introduction to the fundamental principles of *gengo katei setsu*, the LAPT. Part II consists of six chapters: (1) *Onsei ron* 音声論, ‘Vocal sounds,’ (1) *Moji ron* 文字論, ‘Letters/characters,’ (3) *Bunpō ron* 文法論, ‘Grammar,’ (4) *Imi ron* 意味論, ‘Semantics,’ (5) *Keigo ron* 敬語論, ‘Polite expressions,’ and (6) *Kokugobi ron* 国語美論, ‘Aesthetics of the Japanese language.’ Since Part II comprises detailed analyses, based on the LAPT, of the respective subjects, I will focus only on the contents of Part I for present purposes, i.e., to describe how the fundamentals of the LAPT were developed and organized. Listed below are the translations of the contents of Part I (2007a, 3-4):

**Part I: Introduction**

1. Approach toward the study of language
2. The object of the study of language
3. Identifying the object of study through the process of interpretation
4. The subjective (participatory) and observational (detached) perspectives on language
5. Shutai, bamen and sozai as the preconditions for language to exist
6. Criticism of Ferdinand de Saussure’s theory of language
   6.1. Saussure’s theory of language and kokugogaku
   6.2. Analyzing the object of linguistic investigation and the formation of the concept of langue
   6.3. The relationship between parole and langue
   6.4. The langue as fait social
   6.5. Conclusion
7. From the componential view to the processual view
8. The componential elements of language and their processual stages
   8.1. Letters/characters and sounds
   8.2. Concepts
   8.3. Language acquisition
   8.4. Expressive valuation and skill in language
9. Understanding and appreciating language action
10. The social nature of language
11. The concepts of kokugo and nihongo, with a remark on gairaigo
12. Recognition of the historical aspects of kokugo and the concept of langue as the subject of historical change

2.4.1. Language policy in Korea

Moving to Korea as a newly appointed faculty member at Keijô Imperial University was, for Tokieda, a good chance to tackle as a linguist the practical issues of language.

Tokieda admitted, however, that he could not contribute much to the language policy in Korea because of the dilemma created by two conflicting ideologies: one, respecting and protecting the mother tongue and the other, promoting the use of the Japanese language outside Japan (1976a, 47-48). The first ideology was represented in Ueda Kazutoshi’s
Kokugo no tame (1892) (see Section 2.2.2). The problem is that since Ueda’s ideology was formed before either Taiwan or Korea was under Japanese rule, what he meant by “kokugo” mostly corresponds to the Japanese language as mother tongue. The reality after colonization, however, did not always allow one to match kokugo as a mother tongue with the Japanese language; presumably, what was to be respected and protected as “kokugo” in Korea would be the Korean language.

In Korea, Tokieda had the opportunity to re-think and re-define the concept of kokugo and to relate people’s expressive valuation in language to practical problems such as language policy. His definition of kokugo was mentioned first in Kokugogaku shi (1940c) and then in Genron. Let us first look at how he re-defined kokugo. At the very beginning of the introductory section of Kokugogaku shi, Tokieda defined kokugo as “日本語的性格を持った言語, ‘a language that possesses the characteristics of the Japanese language’” (3). This definition may sound too obvious to be of any significance, but, for Tokieda, it was a serious step forward toward making kokugogaku the study of the Japanese language. According to Tokieda, characterization of kokugo by ethnicity and/or nationality was not uncommon at the time (1940c, 3-5). Those kinds of definitions obviously do not work, given the fact that a language can easily cross national and ethnic boundaries. Tokieda also pointed out that the prestigious scholar of the Japanese language, Yamada Yoshio, defined kokugo as the standard language of Japan (1940c, 5). Tokieda criticized this definition as well simply because it excluded Japanese dialects. Considering the shortcomings of the preceding conceptions of kokugo, Tokieda suggested
that the word *kokugo* could be used to refer to the standard Japanese language only in a narrow sense; as the object of Japanese linguistics, however, it should refer to the Japanese language in general (including its dialects) and *kokugogaku* should be renamed Nihongogaku 日本語学, ‘the study of the Japanese language’ (1940c, 4-6). His time in Korea made it possible for Tokieda to reconsider the meaning of *kokugo*, in relation to nationality, ethnicity, and the standard-dialects differentiation.

Within this set of definitions, one essential problem is left unanswered. If *kokugo* is redefined to mean “a language that has characteristics of the Japanese language,” then what exactly are those characteristics? This question is crucial to the LAPT because it is closely related to Tokieda’s fundamental approach to the study of language. He attempts to answer this question in *Kokugogaku shi* (1940c):

...日本語的性格といふことは國語學の究極に於いて見出されるものであって、最初からこれが明かにされて居るならば、もはや國語研究の必要も消滅してしまうことになる。そこで國語を他の何か明かなるもの即ち國家とか民族とかによつて規定しようとする立場が現れて来る譜である。併し乍らこの立場は、宛も「魚は水に住むものである」とふ定義に等しく、對象を外部的原理によって規定することであって、對象自體の持つ原理によるものではない。そこで必要な態度は、兎も角も對象として與へられた無規定な日本語を、それ自體の内に具有する原理即ち日本語的性格なるものを明らかにしつけ、對象を輪郭付けて行くことである。...必要なことは、最初に對象の本質をしっかり見通すことである。勿論この見通しは、對象に就いての省察が進展すると同時に訂正せらるべき性質のものであることも知れないが、その故にかかる見通しが不必要であるといふことは出来ない。... 寧ろかかる對象の本質観の不段の改訂によって次第にその目標に到達することが出来るのである。

... the characteristics of the Japanese language can only be identified at the final stage of the study of the language; if those characteristics were already recognized, there would be no reason for studying the language. However, this argument is similar to say, in defining the fish, ‘The fish is an animal living under water.’ This way of defining an object depends on external principles, not on internal principles that the
object itself possesses. The necessary approach to the study of a language, then, is to first accept the given language as yet to be characterized, and then to delineate the object of study while revealing the internal principles inherent in it; those principles after all are the characteristics of the Japanese language. ... the important thing is to carefully speculate what could be the essence of an object. Of course, this speculation may be of a kind that would require modifications as observation of the object deepens, but that does not undermine the necessity of speculation. ... rather, it is such persistent attempts at amending a speculation about the essence of an object that will help one achieve the goal in the end. (8-10)

By introducing the idea of the expressive valuation in language, Tokieda tried to expand the range of his theoretical framework to include various practical issues of language such as language policy and language education. The issue of language policy in Korea under Japanese rule helped Tokieda substantiate this idea. Tokieda believed that the conflict of two ideologies, i.e., respecting a mother tongue and prioritizing a standard language, should be considered from the perspective of how people value a certain language in a situation in which it is used. It is, after all, the expressive valuation that makes one think that a standardized language is superior to dialects in certain situations. If language action is necessarily influenced by shutai’s expressive valuation, it is also true that realizing valued action requires certain linguistic skills. This is why in Genron Tokieda treated skills in language and shutai’s expressive valuation in the same section.

2.4.2. Tokieda’s study abroad in the West

From the mid-19th century, modern Western linguistics were studied by Japanese scholars for the guiding principles for kokugogaku. It was not until he encountered traditional Japanese linguistics that Tokieda began to question the tendency of uncritically applying the methodologies and objectives of Western linguistics, namely,
the historical, comparative, and typological approaches, to Japanese linguistics. He felt that there was something fundamentally different between the two traditions in their approach to language phenomena. His study abroad in Western countries from 1927 to 1929 only reinforced such doubt, and upon his return to Japan, he delivered a speech on the subject at a research conference at the Tokyo Imperial University. In his speech, Tokieda emphasized the historical and geographical differences between European countries and Japan. Most of the European countries share their territories within one continent, and thereby for thousands of years they have been in close contact with one another. This fact, Tokieda insisted, naturally allowed Western linguistics to develop historical and comparative approaches that could be applied to the study of language. But what about Japan? Tokieda’s attention turned to the influence of the Chinese language:

Tokieda does not talk much about the details of his study abroad in Michi, except for one episode: when he was staying with a family in France, he was often impressed with conversations at the dinner table, in which another Spanish housemate and the host mother talked about how similar or different their native languages were (51-52).
Tokieda attempted to convince his audience of the importance of looking at situations unique to the Japanese language rather than depending too much on Western linguistics for theoretical and methodological principles.

Tokieda became so increasingly convinced of the validity of his research policy to rely on the old *kokugogaku* rather than modern Western linguistics for developing his general theory and methodology of linguistic science; second, his interest in the historical facts concerning the Chinese influence on Japanese was to be reconsidered and integrated into his later conception of language history.

### 2.4.3. From historicizing *kokugogaku* to *Kokugogaku genron*

In this section, my focus is on how Tokieda integrated the findings from his *Kokugogaku shi* project into the organization of the LAPT. From the very beginning of his graduation project, he had been consistent in trying to utilize his study of pre-Meiji *kokugogaku* to obtain insights into Japanese language phenomena and how to address them for scientific examination. Below is Tokieda’s own explanation of his attitude towards the history of *kokugogaku*.

国語を研究の対象として、そこにどのような問題があるかを求め、これを一個の学問の体系に組織し、国語の完き姿を浮彫にして示すためには、何よりも先づ、国語そのものを凝視し、これに沈潜することが必要である ... この際、国語を凝視する眼は、既成概念に煩はされない、言語の本質、国語の特質をよく洞察し得る、何ものにも曖らされない眼でなければならない。... 私は、己を空しくする一つの方法として、また、我々が国語を、また言語を如何に見えるべきかの指針を得るための一つの方法として、国語を凝視して来た眼を、歴史的に跡づけようと試みた。
In order to reveal the entire picture of kokugo by, first, objectifying it and seeking issues in it and then organizing those into a coherent system of study, we need first and foremost to carefully observe and meditate on kokugo per se. ... to do this, such eyes that observe kokugo must be those that can see through the essence of language and the characteristics of kokugo, and will not be disturbed or clouded by any established concepts and ideas. ... I have tried to trace the history of how those assiduous eyes had observed kokugo, as a way to put myself in an objective standpoint and to secure some guiding principles of how we should view kokugo, and language in general. (1976a, 81)

As I mention at the beginning of Section 2.4, Tokieda published two versions of Kokugogaku shi: the first one in 1932 and the second in 1940. The two books investigate the same historical facts, but take two different approaches. Later in his career, Tokieda recollected how his Kokugogaku shi changed in focus from his earlier work in his graduation thesis to the final version in 1940:

As I mention at the beginning of Section 2.4, Tokieda published two versions of Kokugogaku shi: the first one in 1932 and the second in 1940. The two books investigate the same historical facts, but take two different approaches. Later in his career, Tokieda recollected how his Kokugogaku shi changed in focus from his earlier work in his graduation thesis to the final version in 1940:

In the case of my graduation thesis, I focused largely on the development of [language] awareness. However, when I wrote for publication in Iwanami’s “Nihon bungaku kōza 日本文学講座,” I slightly shifted the focus; I mainly took up external things that supported kokugo research, or the question, “In what situations, or out of what necessities, was kokugo research before Meiji period developed?” For example,

---

46 This refers to the first Kokugogaku shi (1932a), which was published in the series Iwanami kōza: Nihon bungaku 岩波講座 日本文学, ‘Iwanami lectures: the Japanese literature.’
before the *Genroku* period, there were studies of the Japanese classical texts, Japanese poetics (*kagaku*), the conventions of *renge*, the learning of Chinese words and characters, and Sanskrit studies, all of which served as background for *kokugo* research. Then, for the *Kokugogaku shi*, which was published as the separate volume in Showa 15 (1940c), I returned to my original focus, the awareness of language. (1968b, 7)

In *Michi*, Tokieda also explained that the second *Kokugogaku shi* (1940c) was written in an effort to bring together his theoretical ideas on language and how the book ended up becoming a transitional step towards *Genron* (1976a, 87).  

The first *Kokugogaku shi* (1932a) focused on scholars’ motivations for studying the Japanese language so that Tokieda could demonstrate that whether or not a study is deemed “scientific” should not be determined by its purpose. Tokieda argued that the pre-Meiji *kokugogaku* achievements had been unfairly dismissed as “unscientific” simply because the work had been mostly conducted to achieve certain goals of *kokugaku*, literally, ‘national studies.’ Tokieda pointed out that one of the distinguishing characteristics of *kokugogaku* is that it has its origin in the practice of annotating classical texts.  

---

47 *Genroku* 元錦 is an era names for the period of 1688 to 1704.
48 For example, *te-ni-o-ha* studies done by Motoori Norinaga and Suzuki Akira among others inspired Tokieda’s core grammatical notions, *shi* and *ji* (Tokieda, 1940c, pp. 69, 147); Tokieda’s idea of classifying the Japanese words based on expressive mental process (*hyōgen katei* 表現過程) was partly inspired by the similar idea of Togashi Hirokage 富樫廣蔵 (1793-1873) (ibid., 187).
49 Before publishing the first *Kokugogaku shi*, Tokieda wrote three essays that discussed the old annotations of *Manyōshū*: the first one (1973a), which was published in 1931, discusses the work of Sengaku 仙覺 (1203?-?); the second (1932c) examines the works of Keichū 契沖 (1640-1701); and the third (1932b) is about the usage of Chinese
kokugakusha endeavored to elucidate the culture and the lives of ancient Japanese people. Tokieda admitted in the Preface of Kokugogaku shi (1932a) that the traditional kokugogaku lacked historical perspective, did not take language as an independent object of study, and failed to establish substantial general rules of language as a whole. However, these apparent deficiencies are recognized only in examining kokugogaku by the standards of modern Western linguistics, which has its own motivations and goals, which are in turn essentially different from those of pre-Meiji kokugogaku.

As part of the Kokugogaku shi project, Tokieda ventured to read the entire (fifty-four-chapter) Genji so that he could experience the process of interpreting and annotating an old text himself, a process it took him about three years to complete. This personal endeavor together with his seminars on Genji at Keijô Imperial University helped Tokieda develop his simple, processual view of language, which he put forth in his graduation thesis, into a full-fledged theory in Genron. The practice of interpreting a linguistic expression was now considered as action of tracing back a process of expression to its origin, that is, as the thought of a performing subject. Language was therefore to be thought of not just as the process of expression; it was also the process of interpretation, or more accurately, that of understanding. In fact, one of Tokieda’s most important conclusions from his interpretative work was that in the study of language one can “observe” a language expression only through the process of interpretation, which is characters in Manyôshû. Tokieda named these annotating practices chûshaku gogaku, lit. ‘Annotation Linguistics’ (Tokieda, 1931, 8).
made possible by re-experiencing the process of the original performer’s expressive action.\textsuperscript{50}

After publishing the first *Kokugogaku shi* in 1932, Tokieda began to organize his ideas into a coherent system of language theory. Remarkably, from 1936 until 1941, the year in which *Genron* appeared, Tokieda wrote about twenty papers, each of which addressed some element of the LAPT. These articles are listed below with their publication dates and the English translations in brackets.

1933.12 國語學の體系についての短見
 ‘My opinion on the organization of kokugogaku’

1936.3 語の意味の體系的組織は可能であるか
 ‘Is it possible to systematically organize the meanings of words? The origin of this question and a preparatory investigation for the solution’

1936.10 国語の名詞分類についての疑点
 ‘Some doubts on the Japanese parts of speech’

1936.10 形容詞形容動詞の連用形に於ける述語格と副詞格との識別について
 ‘How to distinguish the predicative case from the adverbial case of the Japanese adjectives and adjectival verbs in their renyô form’

1937.3 文の解釈上より見た助詞助動詞
 ‘Japanese particles and auxiliary verbs from the perspective of sentence interpretation’

1937.6 心的過程としての言語本質観（一）
 ‘A view of the essence of language as a mental process, part 1’

1937.7 心的過程としての言語本質観（二）
 ‘A view of the essence of language as a mental process, part 2’

1937.8 語の形式的接続と意味的接続
 ‘The formal and semantic connections between words’

1937.11 文の概念について（上）
 ‘On the concept of the sentence, part 1’

\textsuperscript{50} Tokieda described this argument in detail in *Genron* (Section 3, Part I, pp. 34-38)
1937.12 文の概念について (下)
‘On the concept of the sentence, part 2’

1937.11 言語過程に於ける美的形式について (一): 言語美学の対象と方法
‘Aesthetic forms of the language process: the object and methodology of linguistic aesthetics, part 1’

1938.1 言語過程に於ける美的形式について (二): 言語美学に於ける対象と方法
‘Aesthetic forms of the language process: the object and methodology of linguistic aesthetics, part 2’

1938.5 言語に於ける場面の制約について
‘On the constraints of bamen in language’

1938.6 場面と敬辞法との機能的関係について
‘On the functional relationship between bamen and polite expressions’

1938.10 國語のリズム研究上の諸問題
‘Some issues in the study of the rhythm of the Japanese language’

1939.2 敬語法及び敬辞法の研究
‘A grammatical study of polite expressions’

1939.3 言語に於ける単位と単語について
‘On units of language and the word’

1940.2 懸論の語学的考察とその表現美
‘A linguistic examination of kakekotoba and its aesthetic quality’

1940.2 國語学と國語の価値及び技術論
‘kokugogaku and the expressive valuation and the skill in kokugo’

1940.7 言語に対する二の立場——主體的立場と観察的立場——
‘The two standpoints vis-à-vis language: the subjective and the observational’

1941.1 言語の存在條件——主體・場面・素材——
‘The preconditions for language to exist: shutai, bamen, and sozai’

The first article in the above list, “My opinion on the organization of kokugogaku,” was written in response to the idea that Kikuzawa Sueo 菊澤季生 (1900-1985) proposed in his essay, “Shinkó kokugogaku no saiken” (新興国語学の再建), ‘Rebuilding new
In his essay, Tokieda mildly questioned Kikuzawa’s view of language and his orientation to the study of language. In the same piece, Tokieda also presented his own view of language, his approach to the study of language, and his research plan, as quoted below:

Mr. Kikuzawa bases his research on the analyzed elements of language, sound and meaning. That would be one view, and one way. However, I cannot help holding a view that language is an activity of expression and of understanding. I think that language would not be such a ready-made “entity,” but “action/process.” (83)

Kikuzawa insists that *kokugogaku* should follow the principles of (Western) linguistics (1933, 16). Kikuzawa ascribed the stagnation of *kokugogaku* to the fact that linguistic ideas at that time were imported and studied largely through English works, and much less through French and German ones (ibid.). He does not name specific works or theories that new *kokugogaku* should consult, instead, he proposes the idea that language can be analyzed into two elements: linguistic sounds (*onsei* 聲), which are the external form of language (*gaikei* 外形), and meaning (*igi* 意義), which is the content of language (*naiyô* 内容) (17). In the study of linguistic sounds he recognizes *onso ron* 音素論, ‘study of basic speech sounds,’ and *on’in ron* 音韻論, ‘study of syllabic units’; within the study of meaning, he identifies *gogi ron* 語義論, ‘lexical semantics,’ and *bunpô ron* 文法論, ‘study of grammar’ (18-21). Kikuzawa also proposes other objects of linguistic study based on the interrelation between language and society: various styles or genres in language expression (*yôshiki ron* 様式論), language variations (*yôsô ron* 様相論), and linguistic typology (*kôsei ron* 構成論) (22-24). He also emphasizes the importance of diachronic approach (*tsûjiteki dôteki* 過時的・動的) as well as synchronic one (*kyôjiteki selteki* 共時的・静的) to the study of language (24).
Just as a “wave” is not an “entity” composed of wind and water but an “action/process” of the water moved by the wind, language is not an “entity” that is analyzed into letters/characters, sounds, meanings and such, but an “action/process” of expression/understanding where one links letters/characters, or the sound, to a meaning. (83)

... wouldn’t it rather be the case that research areas should not be developed according to the sounds and meanings abstracted from language, but by means of explicating and deciding where the sound and the meaning should be placed in language? (85)

I would argue that what I can experience as language is not anything but my mental activities of expressing and understanding in my daily life. ... that, I believe, is the starting point of the kokugo research. (85)

In this plan, both the organization of kokugogaku and its research areas have been left undetermined. I have just indicated the starting point and the direction. In fact, these are all the ideas I have right now. (86)
Tokieda went on to carry out this kind of plan throughout the latter half of the 1930s.

As a result, he published articles on the main ideas of the LAPT such as:

1. the classification of words based on the processual differences of expression (1973d, originally published in 1937)
2. a language phenomenon as a dynamic, successive mental process as opposed to a static unit composed of a sound and a concept (1973e, originally in 1937)
3. the definition of a sentence (1937b, 1937c)
4. the aesthetics of language (1937d, 1938a, 1940a)
5. the principles of identifying language units (1939b)
6. people’s expressive valuation and skills in acts of language (1940b)
7. the preconditions of language: shutai, bamen, and sozai (1973f, originally in 1938; 1973h, originally in 1941)
8. the subjective and observational standpoints (1973g, originally in 1940)

All of these ideas were to be included in Part I of *Genron*, in which, as the title indicates, Tokieda presented his principles of the science of language. Among the various fundamental concepts presented in *Genron*, the central notion was the process whereby shutai, a performing subject, expresses her thought or tries to understand other person’s thought by means of linguistic sounds or letters/characters. Tokieda illustrated this process in “‘its most basic form’ (その最も基本的な形式に於いて)” as Figure 1 below (2007a, 110). Using this central notion of language as the foundation, Tokieda expanded his theoretical framework to include the concepts of bamen, shutai and sozai as the three preconditions of language. Among them, however, bamen is the most important concept. One could argue that it is only as a result of considering bamen that the other
two conditions become salient; in fact, Tokieda wrote his article on *bamen* before the one on the preconditions in general. As I mentioned at the beginning of Section 2.4, there is evidence that Tokieda benefited from Husserl’s phenomenology as it had been introduced by Yamauchi in 1929. In his article, ‘On the constraints of *bamen* in language,’ published in 1938, Tokieda quotes two phenomenological terms from Yamanouchi’s *Genshôgaku josetsu*:

*Bamen* refers to the self’s state of consciousness in which the external world surrounding the subjective self and the subjective self intending toward the external world are unified. From an objective perspective, we can call *bamen* “*intentionales Objekt*” (Yamanouchi’s *Genshôgaku josetsu*, p. 321). When I am talking to young boy(s) and/or girl(s), they are in front of me as adorable, innocent beings. They exist in front of me as my object of intention before, as well as after I start talking to them. They are the bamen of my language action. Because *bamen* is the subjective self’s intentional object, a certain object and its corresponding intentional object, i.e., *bamen*, are not necessarily identical. There are cases in which a thing that seems one identical object if seen from the objective viewpoint can become different object if looked as *bamen*; the relationship between young people and I has to be different from the relationship between the same young people and a teacher. This fact can be named “*attentionale Modifikation*” in phenomenological terms (*Genshôgaku josetsu*, p. 325).  
(1973f, 349)
Below, Figure 2 represents *bamen* as the combination of C-D and B. As Tokieda himself explained later in his career, C-D corresponds to “ノエマ ‘noema,’ ” and B corresponds to “ノエシス ‘noesis’ ” (Tokieda, 1960, 202). Noema represents, in Tokieda’s term, “対象の面,” the ‘intended object,’ and noesis represents “その対象の面に志向する志向作用,” the ‘function of intending toward that object’ (ibid.). Thus, it is obvious that the concept of *bamen* requires a person who intends a certain object, i.e., *shutai*, or the acting self. *Sozai* on the other hand, is not directly drawn from the analysis of *bamen*, but rather, comes from the processual structure of language per se; *sozai* corresponds to “concrete things” or “mental content” at the starting and ending point of the language process (see Figure 1).

The publication of *Genron* in 1941 meant the completion of establishing the principles of Tokieda’s language theory, and also the conclusion of some of the research tasks that he had set for himself in 1924 (See 2.3.2). However, there remained issues that needed further elaboration and development, namely, the social nature of language and the history of language. The former led to the study of language communication and the functions of language, while the latter, to that of language life. His theory of literature as the object of language science was also to be added to the LAPT’s framework. However, it was not until after the end of World War II that Tokieda would begin to deal with those issues.
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Figure 1. Diagram of language as process (Tokieda, 2007a, 111)

Figure 2. A phenomenological diagram of *bamen* (Tokieda, 2007a, 61)

Figure 3. The triadic preconditions of language (Tokieda, 2007a, 58)

\(^{52}\) In the original of Figure 1, all the words are written in Japanese.
2.5. Expanding and reorganizing the theoretical framework

Despite the significant achievement of *Genron*, Tokieda became aware of one crucial defect concerning the organization of his work. *Genron* consists of Part I and Part II; the former explicates the fundamental principles of the LAPT, and the latter applies those principles to issues discussed within traditional categories of modern linguistics and *kokugogaku*, such as phonology/phonetics, letters/characters, grammar, and semantics.

Tokieda explains what he perceives as the shortcomings of *Genron* in the succeeding volume, *Kokugogaku genron zokuhen* (hereafter referred to as *Zokuhen*), published in 1955.

... 各論は、当然、『正篇』の総論の展開したものであるべき箇であるが、実は、この各論の組織は、在来の言語学、国語学の諸部門をそのまま踏襲したに過ぎないものであって、そこには、まだ、言語過程説独自の体系というものは、打出されていなかった。

... the chapters in Part II of *Genron* should have addressed the principles that Part I of *Genron* presented, but in reality, these chapters merely borrowed the categories used in mainstream linguistics and *kokugogaku*; there, the LAPT’s unique organization was yet to be seen. (2008, 18)

Then what was the unique organization? Tokieda explains what he did in *Genron* and tells us what he tries to do in *Zokuhen*, as follows:

言語過程説は、言語において、人間を取り戻そうとするのである。言語は、その本質において、人間の行為の一形式であり、人間活動の一であるとする時、何よりも肝要なことは、言語を、人間的事実の中において、人間的事実との関連において、これを観察することである。
What the LAPT tries to do is bring humans back into language. When we define language as, in its essence, a form of human action, and one of the human activities, the most important thing is to observe it within human facts and in its relations with those facts.

What I did in *Genron* was to take such language away from those facts, and to describe language’s own structure per se; *Zokuhen*, on the other hand, follows the main theme of the LAPT, and tries to seek out the primary issues of language in its most concrete forms. (2008, 20-21)

As Tokieda explains above, *Genron* focused more on language per se, as a subjective human activity, and for that reason, some scholars interpreted his theory as a kind of ‘individualistic psychology’ (個人心理学) and critiqued it for not explaining the social nature of language, as Saussurean linguists did (1976b, 98). In reality, however, *Genron* did explain the social nature of language, but it did so in a fundamentally different manner. Because *Genron* emphasized the subjective mental process of language action, it characterized the social nature of language in terms of how a subject expresses awareness of her own social status relative to a *bamen* (including a listener) and *sozai* (2007a, 164). This notion, however, only explains how the subject adjusts her expressions according to social contexts. In *Zokuhen*, on the other hand, Tokieda added the aspect of how the subject actively creates a certain relationship with the addressee by means of her
language acts. In other words, in Zokuhen, Tokieda dealt with the social functions of language action that had been left out of Genron. Consequently, he took the question of communication as the fundamental fact for analyzing various functional relationships between language and aspects of human life. Now, in order to see how Tokieda incorporated his new ideas on language into Zokuhen, let us briefly look at its contents. Because Part I is a general introduction to the fundamentals of the LAPT, I only list the contents of Part II below:

Part II
Chapter 1: Communicating thoughts in language
1. The fact of communication
   1.1. How communication has been studied
   1.2. Sounds and letters/characters as the media of communication
   1.3. The conceptualizing process in communication
   1.4. The importance of defining concepts and describing things in language
   1.5. Flexibility and constraints in action of understanding
   1.6. Subjectivity and objectivity in communication
2. Conditions of (un)successful communication
   2.1. Various aspects of communication: correct interpretation, misunderstanding, intentional misinterpretation
   2.2. Conditions of (un)successful communication
3. Functions of standardized language and the commonality/constancy of language media in communication
4. Facts of communication as objects of appreciation
Chapter 2: Functions of language
1. The functional relationship between language and life
2. Functions of language
   2.1. Practical (instrumental) functions
   2.2. Socializing functions
   2.3. Appreciative (鑑賞) functions

Tokieda mentioned in Michi that he owed his idea of human social nature to Ningen no gaku to shite no rinrigaku 人間の学としての倫理学 (1934), ‘Ethics as the study of humanity,’ by Watsuji Tetsurô 和辻哲郎 (1889-1960) (104).
Chapter 3: Language and literature
3.1. The relationship between the study of language and that of literature
3.2. An idea that language is the medium of literary expression
3.3. The relationship between language and literature from the perspective of the LAPT
3.3.1. Literature is language: continuity between literature and language
3.3.2. What distinguishes literature from language

Chapter 4. Language and life
4.1. Actual situations of language life
4.2. Spoken language and written language
4.3. Kōgo (口語) and bungo (文語)
4.4. Standard language and dialects
4.5. Literature and life
4.6. An aspect of the relation between language and life in Charles Bally

Chapter 5. Language and society, and the social nature of language
5.1. The question of the social nature of language in Genron
5.2. The sociological study of language in the school of linguistic sociology (言語社会学派)
5.3. Social functions of language in the LAPT
5.4. Social functions of language and grammatical theory
5.5. Functions of ji 詞 that create interpersonal relations
   5.5.1. Some of the kandōshi 感動詞 ‘emotive particles’
   5.5.2. Jodōshi 助動詞 ‘auxiliaries’ of honorific and humble expressions
   5.5.3. Jodōshi of conjecture
   5.5.4. Jodōshi of negation
   5.5.5. Joshi 助詞 ‘particles’

Chapter 6: Things that shape the history of language
6.1. Componential approach to language history and the history of language life
6.2. The relationship between language history and the history of politics, society, and culture
6.3. Linguistic interests
6.4. Texts as data and texts as objects of study
6.5. Characteristics of the history of kokugo
   6.5.1. The tree diagram and the river diagram
   6.5.2. Assimilating foreign languages and their methods
   6.5.3. Kata 型 ‘patterns’ in expression
6.5.4. Changes in the valuation of language
6.6. The history of literature and language life
(2008, 3-7)

As we can see from the above contents, the LAPT now contains a vast array of language-related issues that were not, normally in 1955, treated on a par with the core areas of modern linguistics, such as phonology/phonetics, morphology, syntax, and semantics. It is important to note that these new objects of study were not added simply for the purpose of expanding Tokieda’s theoretical framework, but, rather, were basically arrived at deductively, from the principles that were already proposed in *Genron*.

Before publishing *Zokuhen* in 1955, Tokieda completed two books on Japanese grammar: *Nihon bunpō kōgo hen* 日本文法 口語篇 (1950) and *Nihon bunpō bungo hen* 日本文法 文語篇 (1954). These books are now well recognized as representative works of the so-called Tokieda grammar. His classification of Japanese words based on *shi* and *ji* remains controversial and has been often referenced, although not necessarily as a standard distinction, by many within the field of Japanese linguistics in Japan. I will end this section with a quote from one of his last essays on his grammatical principles:

... 今日の学校文法には、どれがいわゆる自我の能動的統一作用であるかを指摘することは困難である。なぜそのようになったかといえば、今日の文法理論は、人間の外に存在すると考えられている言語（ソシュール理論における「ラング」の如きもの）から抽象されたものだからである。そこでは、ものをいう人間というものが全然捨象されている。思惟とは無関係なものとして言語が考えられている。思惟とは無関係な言語が、はたして言語といい得るかということには、根本的な問題があるにしても。

このような人間不在の文法論に対して、それを矯正するものとして提出されたのが、世にいわゆる時枝文法である。これまでもたびたび述べてきたよ
... One can hardly point out, in today’s school grammar, which elements indicate the active, integrating functions of a self. This is because today’s grammatical theory has been abstracted from a language that is assumed to exist outside human beings (like Saussure’s *langue*). Human beings are completely excluded from such grammar. Language is considered irrelevant to thinking, though it may be an essential question in the first place whether we can call such a thing “language” at all.

It is the so-called Tokieda grammar that was proposed in order to correct such non-human grammar. As I have often explained elsewhere, I established the “Tokieda grammar” by correcting and organizing traditional Japanese grammars, and structuring its system so that it corresponds to people’s forms of thinking. (1967, 6-7)
Conclusion

Tokieda’s language-as-process theory clearly denies a view of language as a static entity. Tokieda insists that language is a mental process, which people engage in when they express their own thoughts or understand the thoughts of others. One can “observe” the other person’s language act only by means of an interpretation of that act, because language is essentially subjective; it is impossible to experience the other person’s mental process per se as is. Once language is defined as subjective human action in which people express their thinking, it is possible to consider and identify preconditions that enable such action. Tokieda utilized a phenomenological construal of human consciousness, which consists of a certain object and a self’s intention directed toward that object. Language has to be performed in a certain social/psychological context, which Tokieda called bamen. This concept of bamen along with a performing subject (shutai) and contents (sozai) to be expressed by shutai form the triad of language preconditions. For another indispensable element of language is people’s expressive valuation of language, and the skills that allow them to execute their preferred expressions; the two concepts are combined to explain shutai’s creative efforts to express his/her ideas more effectively. This expressive valuation of language can also be a useful concept when explaining issues of language policy and language problems as when, for example, different people
prefer different ways of talking or writing over other ways in different situations. Tokieda expanded the framework of his theory to include such issues as linguistic communication, the social nature of language, literature as a language activity, language life, and the history of language. These added issues were not to be treated separately, but explained consistently by previously established principles.

In conclusion, it is an interesting question that how similar or different the LAPT is, compared with other language views and theories, such as the view of Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835), speech act theory, discourse/conversation analysis, Roy Harris’ integrational linguistics, or usage-based linguistics, among others. A comparative approach to studying the LAPT, however, requires a thorough understanding of its principles and implications. What I have attempted in this thesis will, I hope, enhance our understanding of Tokieda’s theory. For me this study has been a first step in preparing myself for a critical and comparative examination of the LAPT.
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