"Estimations" in Japanese –
some empirical investigations and consequences for Japanese as Foreign Language

*Gerhard Dillmann (Bochum University Institute
of Intensive Language Training, Japonicum)*

Abstract

Starting from the idea that a change of perspective on function-to-form teaching is necessary for foreign-language learning in general and Japanese as Foreign Language (JFL) in particular, this article shows the potential of empirical text analysis for developing function-to-form language teaching materials. In Section 1, the general idea of the function-to-form approach is explained and briefly discussed in relation to the linguistic concept of speech act theory and to contrastive pragmatics. Section 2 discusses the theoretical and methodological background for the empirical text analysis, presenting Hugo Steger's Model of Speech Intentions as a reference model for the analysis of illocutionary force as the term is used in speech act theory, along with a description of the methodological procedure of empirical text segmentation and of ascribing speech intention types to the segmented utterance tokens. Section 3 gives an analysis of an empirical text sample, a Japanese editorial on disarmament talks, and a sample evaluation of the data with regard to the linguistic realization forms of the type "estimation". In Section 4, some conclusions are drawn for the application of functional analysis of this kind to foreign language learning and actual classroom work.

1. The pragmalinguistic question for foreign language learning: "function to form" or "form to function"?

Making "estimations" is one of the central language functions in elaborate discourse activity. Competence in doing this adequately is therefore an important target in foreign language teaching in general as well as in JFL in particular. But the question is how to define this language function and discover what forms of linguistic realization it has in the specific target language in question.

Looking at the actual situation of the methods applied in foreign language teaching, it can be said that the functional approach which emerged in the 1970s has become an established methodological standard. A closer look into actual practice and at language teaching materials, however, shows that this holds true only for language functions which are closely related to a specific situational context, such as greeting, thanking, introducing people or making requests in shopping situations. It appears that it is the situation itself, rather than the language functions, which leads to their introduction into the classroom.

If language functions which are completely or relatively neutral in terms of correlating to particular situations are taken into consideration, it becomes clear that functions such as estimations and evaluations are usually not systematically integrated in the curriculum. Rather, the common knowledge repertoire in foreign language teaching usually runs only in the direction from form to function and neither the other way round, nor in both directions. However, a teacher's competence in the opposite direction, from function to form, is desirable if the education target of doing things through words adequately in the target language is to be dealt with.

The general idea of speech act theory, put forward first by John L. Austin (1975), is that saying something is doing something. This implies that there is always a function beyond the lexical and grammatical elements of a proposition, that is, the intention (the illocutionary point) that the speaker or writer has in mind in saying something.[1]

If these ideas are included in foreign language learning, three fields of application emerge:

(1) the illocutionary force of given utterances

(2) non-verbal contexts

(3) text coherence and text structure

These three perspectives are closely linked to three kinds of problems that students encounter in the course of foreign language learning.

---

[1] "Intention" refers here to propositional content related intention in the threefold concept of intentional analysis as developed by Strawson (1964), a concept which on the whole has been adopted by Searle, who integrated it into his classic book on speech act theory (Searle 1969). The use of the term "intention" in the sense of the central, proposition-related intention is also to be found in Hugo Steger's model of speech intentions (Steger 1987), which I will use as a reference model in this paper. For details of the model and Steger's terminology, see below. For recent overviews of speech act theory, see, for example, Vanparys (1994), Weigand (2003) and Sadock (2004).

(1) Text complexity: based on the assumption of a broad definition of "text", ranging from minimal texts in the form of one-word-sentences to long texts such as novels, text complexity refers to problems of learning progression, from short and simple form units to longer and more complex units in both speech reception and speech production.

(2) Pragmatic complexity: Steger (1991: 431–434) offers a model of language processing which treats language processing on the level of virtual models in the brain. According to this model, cognitive processes are managed by the interaction of three modules: (a) the lexicon device, (b) the grammar device and (c) the "pragmatic apparatus". This pragmatic apparatus is a governing device which provides the necessary selections from the first two modules, thereby forming pragmatically adequate expressions for specific situations.

(3) Contrastive Complexity: these forms of combination pose difficulties for foreign language learners when they differ from those in their own language. Structures in the target language (L2) that are difficult for the learner if they differ in some respect from the corresponding structures in the first language (L1) fall into the field of "contrastive complexity". However complicated the lexical, morpho-syntactical or pragmatic structure or the form unit may be, if they correspond between L2 and L1, then all that needs to be learned is the elements themselves. In other words, no further information or training about function–form or content–expression correlation is necessary.

This paper explores language functions with regard to their pragmatic complexity and contrastive relevance. It aims to answer questions of how certain language functions, as put forward by speech act theory, are related to virtual linguistic realization forms, that is, to the forms of combinations of lexical and grammatical elements that are actually possible for the expression of a particular pragmatic function. This is done by a sample analysis of a specific linguistic function: estimation. I will further restrict myself by limiting the analysis to one single text, a Japanese editorial, and by focusing the form-function analysis at the level of single function units. Phenomena of text cohesion and illocutionary functions at the level of speech act sequences, paragraphs and the global text are not taken into consideration. Three concrete research questions are addressed:

(1) What are the actual linguistic realization forms of estimations?

(2) Are there any strikingly frequent and/or typical forms of the function in question?

(3) Which forms are "marked" in the sense of contrastive relevance?

Due to the quantitative restriction to just one text and the qualitative restriction to the text type "editorial", the answers to these research questions can only be limited.

Let me add a few words on theoretical and methodological requirements. If single language functions in the sense of illocutionary types are taken into consideration, the model of speech act taxonomy that they refer to needs to be clarified. Secondly, in order to identify virtual realization forms of specific functions, methodological reflection on where and how they can be detected is required. Finally, usage of empirical text material requires explanation of why the text materials used have been chosen, where the elements of a specific language function can be found within the text, what the segmentation principles are, and how to decide what functions are actually expressed by the pieces of utterance segmented. Before turning to the analysis itself, I will address these issues briefly.

2. Speech act theory and empirical text analysis

A Japanese editorial from 1983 on the topic of disarmament talks between the former Soviet Union and the U. S. was chosen as a text for analysis. Choosing an editorial as the object of analysis has the advantage that this type of text is still compact enough to grasp the structure of the text as a whole while providing sufficient empirical data with regard to the speech act "estimating" (see below). This is because editorials present arguments, which imply the necessity to provide estimations. The taxonomic model for the analysis of types of speech acts used in this paper is that of Steger's (1987) speech intentions model (*Sprechintentionenmodell*). In the following section, I will contrast this to the better-known speech act classification model of John R. Searle (1979).

2.1. Categories and terminology

Steger's "speech intention" correlates with Searle's "illocutionary point" of speech acts. It refers to what is intended to be done by the act of saying something. A "speech act" in orthodox speech act theory is termed an "intention act" (*Intentionsakt*) in Steger's model. It is constituted of the defining elements of speech intention, time reference, speaker–hearer identification and speaker–hearer orientation. The category "state of affairs" is not part of this definition, but, on the whole, the notion of speech intention implies the concept of propositional content. In Steger's model,

the typological concept (classification of speech acts on the basis of shared illocutionary points in speech act theory) is the classification of single actual utterance units into virtual types of speech intentions based on shared "intentions".

Steger (1987: I–II) lists the following main types of speech intentions, with additional code numbers for later identification:

(1) On the level of social and communicative relations

00 establishing, managing, and finishing social and communicative relations

(2) On the level of propositions

10 requesting to speak or act

20 stating facts

30 estimating intellectually (cognitively)

40 estimating concerning social norms or/and feelings

50 presenting rationalisations or/and explanations

(3) On the level of actions

60 acting

In summary, the typological correspondences between Steger's model and Searle's taxonomy appear as follows:

Tab. 1: Types of speech acts and speech intentions

Searle	Steger
	00 Establishing, managing, and finishing social and communicative relations
Directives	10 Requesting to speak or act
Assertives	20 Stating facts
	30 Estimating intellectually (cognitively)
	40 Estimating concerning social norms or/and feelings
Expressives	
	50 Presenting rationalisations or/and explanations
Commissives	60 Acting
Declaratives	

As this comparison shows, the Steger system is the more elaborate one. It has an additional dimension of intentions relating to the level of communicative situation and/or the social contact, and Searle's category of "assertives" is split up into three different types. This differentiation proves to be very useful for the analysis of elaborate discourse, especially in the field of argumentative discourse types. Searle's "expressives" correspond to subtypes in Steger's 00-type, and Searle's "commissives"

correspond to "acting" in Steger's model.[2] In favour of choosing the Steger model for the present purpose are its stringent theoretical approach and the classifications, which are easily applicable for an empirical analysis. For the purposes of this paper, I will not go into further theoretical and classificatory details but will concentrate on the types relevant for estimations.

Let us consider the subtypes of type 30 and type 40. Steger's (1987: I–II) subtypes for "intellectual (cognitive) estimations" and "estimations concerning social norms or/and feelings" are as follows:

Type 30: Intellectual (cognitive) estimations

31 cognitive estimations of factual possibility/probability/correctness

32 cognitive estimations of logical truth/verifiability

33 indications of consensus/dissent/indecisiveness

Type 40: Estimations concerning social norms or/and feelings

41 estimation of absolute or relative normality

42 estimation of absolute or relative importance/relevance

43 estimation of absolute or relative quality

44 estimation of absolute or relative aesthetic form

45 estimation of absolute or relative utility

46 estimation of absolute or relative suitability/permission

47 estimation of relatively positive value of feeling or mood

48 estimation of absolutely or relatively negative value of feeling or mood

49 estimation of absolutely or relatively neutral value of feeling or mood

One of the greatest problems of functional text analysis is the methodological question of how to segment the empirical text, that is, how to decide what the smallest units representing a speech act or an act of speech intention are. In the analysis presented in this paper I applied the following rules:

---

[2] Needless to say, there are other taxonomic models. Vanparys (1994: 285) quotes no less than 42 classification models, and Weigand (2003: 39–56) discusses 41 proposals, some different from those mentioned in Vanparys. The most recent taxonomies are those of Vanparys (1994), Sadock (1994), and Weigand (2003: 72–167). It must not be forgotten that a large number of the topics discussed in speech act theory in the context of speech act types have to do with mood of sentence or utterance respectively. So in my view it is the rich tradition of mood studies in Japanese linguistics that explains the fact that there is no genuine contribution to speech act classification or to speech act theory in general on the part of Japanese linguistics. A contrastive survey of both approaches is Akatsuka and Tsubomoto (1998). As for mood studies in Japanese linguistics, see Adachi (1999), Aihara (1999), and Nitta (2002).

(1) Sentence end was used to mark the borders of speech intentions, that is, subsequent sentences are counted as distinct acts of speech intention.

(2) Subordinate or coordinate clauses within compound sentences were counted as distinct speech intention acts if the propositional content of the clause itself was asserted. In other words, if the scope of the speech intention was the whole sentence, then the parts of this sentence did not count as distinct units. For example, the propositional content of restrictive relative clauses was seen as belonging to that of the main clause, whereas non-restrictive relative clauses were treated as being speech intention acts in their own right.

(3) If a segment was embedded within a sentence which possessed a distinct thema-rhema structure and could thus be regarded as being asserted on its own, it was treated as a distinct speech intention act.

(4) Quotations with a single quoted sentence were counted as one single unit on the whole, because only the quoting expression was considered to be asserted and not the quoted sentence. If, however, the quoted part consists of two or more separate sentences in the sense of rules (2) and (3), then the whole quotation was counted as two or more units.

(5) Single lexical elements expressing a language function different from the function of the sentence in which they occurred were counted as elliptical speech intention acts in their own right.

A further methodological problem which needed to be solved was the question of how to decide what type of speech intention the individual pieces of speech intention acts, segmented by application of the rules listed above, belonged to. For this purpose, the Steger model of speech intentions contains "test phrases"; by applying these, speech intention types can be assigned to empirical speech intention act tokens. See Steger (1987: 6) for the test phrases.[3]

In summary, the following methodological approach was taken:

(1) The text was segmented according to the segmentation rules given above, and the single speech intention act units were numbered. In addition, the paragraphs were numbered continuously. The paragraph numbers are given at the beginning of the paragraph.

---

[3] It should be noted that this segmentation procedure does not work, however, merely by mechanical application of formal rules to the linguistic tokens in question, but that hermeneutic understanding of what is said is necessary in order to be able to decide what the propositional scope of each speech intention act is.

(2) By application of the test phrases, the type of speech intention realized in the tokens identified by applying the steps outlined in (1) was identified.

(3) The form of the linguistic realization of each speech intention act was identified in order to identify pragmatic cues by which speech intentions are recognized.

(4) The linguistic realization forms of particular speech intention acts were filtered out and categorized with regard to their pragma-linguistic and contrastive relevance, that is, with regard to the frequency of occurrence and of markedness in the sense of differences between L1 and L2. The hypothesis is that there are very general indicators, non-specific to certain function classes, on the one hand, and more or less specific indicators only used to express specific communicative goals or intentions on the other. This type of specific indicator is of high relevance for linguistic analysis of foreign language learning.

For the sake of brevity, I concentrate only on those segments where speech intention acts of type 30 (intellectual/cognitive estimations) and type 40 (estimations concerning social norms or/and feelings) are manifested. For the whole text with the morphological transliteration and English translation, see Appendix I.

3. Empirical analysis

As a first step in analysing the linguistic realization forms, feature formulae listing of all elements of the single tokens which might be relevant with regard to speech intention were recorded. The elements considered to be functionally relevant are as follows:

(1) Lexical elements

Specific lexical units indicating and/or reinforcing the speech intention in question. These free lexical elements were coded within the feature "Lex".

(2) Grammatical elements

(a) The main sentence- or clause-final categories of verb, adjective, nominal adjective, and noun were recorded as V-Ru, A-i, NA-Da and N-Da in their informal, present tense and affirmative forms.[4]

---

[4] For the abbreviation conventions, see the abbreviations and symbols used in grammar books, for example, in Makino and Tsutsui (1986) and (1995) or in Kaiser *et al.* (2001). The capital R in the formula V-Ru stands for the fact that the verb ending of the recorded form varies between *-ru* and *-u*; correspondingly,

(b) The morpho-semantic category past tense was recorded as Ta; affirmation vs. negation as Ø vs. Nai[5] and initiative as -Yō; and volitive as "-Tai".

(c) The clause- or sentence-final morpho-syntactic form finite (Ø), semi-finite (-\) and binding (-Te) were coded accordingly.

(d) For verbs, active voice (Ø) versus passive voice ("pV") was differentiated.

(e) Clause- or sentence-final semantic extensions or phrase elements which either contain illocutionary force indicating elements themselves or which are related to such elements, for example, modal extensions like *ba naranu* [must] or *beki da* [should], or sentence explanatory extensions like *no de aru* [it is that], were recorded in their actual form, written in small letters and italics.

(f) Some specific verb-semantic categories, such as imperative (V_{imp}), volitive (V_{vol}), and quotative (V_{quo}) were differentiated.

(g) Quotative nouns were recorded as N_{quo} (see List of abbreviations).

With these methodological and coding conventions in mind, let us turn to linguistic realization forms of segments in which estimations were expressed (speech intention types 30 and 40). First, an overview of the number of occurrences for the different types of speech intentions in the text (Table 2) is given. Next, speech intention acts of type 30 and 40 are isolated from the text corpora and listed according to their sequence order (Tables 3 and 4). Finally, the linguistic realization forms identified in the single speech intention acts are grouped into types of preliminary linguistic realization forms and discussed.

The analysis of the quantitative distribution of single speech intention types led to the following results:

---

the writing convention Da is meant to cover *da* as well as the *de aru*-form. In contrast to this the -i in A-i is always actual "*-i*" and therefore written in minuscule. With the writing conventions for N and NA correspondingly, I want to point out that all forms are morphemic shortcut writing, schematically assimilated to the formulae for V and A. Formulae like N+Da, N+Da-Ta etc. would be closer to the actual morphemic form, but because the +Da notation gets too longwinded in the combined forms for past and/or negation I prefer the schematic shortcut form.

[5] The schematic forms V-Nai, A-Nai and N-Nai/NA-Nai for the present/negated-form, or V-Nai-Ta, "A-Nai-Ta and N-Nai-Ta/NA-Nai-Ta for the negated/past-form combination -Nai is written with capital letter, because it is also meant to cover negation forms parallel to *nai*, such as *nu*, and secondly, because it is not always actually *nai*, as for example, in the past form *nakatta*.

Tab. 2: Quantitative distribution of speech intention types

Type	Number of acts	Percentage
00	1	1.5 %
20	29	44.7 %
30	16	24.6 %
40	19	29.2 %
Total	65	100 %

The total of the types 30 and 40 amounts to 53.8 percent, which confirms our expectation that the text type "editorial" provides a high number of estimation acts.

Let us now consider the speech intention acts of making estimations. Listed in Table 3 (speech intention type 30) and Table 4 (speech intention type 40) are, from left to right, (1) the basic type in question, (2) the subtype, (3) the speech intention act number and (4) a formula feature protocol of the linguistic realization forms of the given speech intention act.

Tab. 3: Type 30

Type		Act No.	Linguistic realization form
Basic	Subtype		
30	31	12	Lex + V-Te-Iru
		13	V-Ru + Da-Yō
		15	N *de* + V-Ta
		18	pV-Ru *to* V-Ru
		21	Lex + *mono*-Nai
		24	Lex + *dake*-Da
		34	V-Ba\ V-Ru + *koto ni* Naru
		37	Lex + V-Ta *no wa* + N-Da
		46	Lex + N+Aru-Yō
		47	V-Te-Iru
		50	N+Aru-Yō
		54	N-*wa* + *mono*-Nai-\
		55	V-Ru
		58	N-*dake* + V-Te
		59	V-Te-Iru
		64	N+*shika* + Nai

Tab. 4: Type 40

Type		Act No.	Linguistic realization form
Basic	Subtype		
40	42	9	V_{vol}-Tai
		14	V-Ru + *beki*-Da
		16	pV-Nai-Ba Nara-Nai
		17	A-i *hodo* + Lex
		30	*kore hodo* + Lex + V-Ta *no wa* + *hajimete*-Da
		31	V-Te + V_{vol}-Tai
		32	V-Ru\ + *beki*-Da
		35	V-Ru + *beki*-Da
		36	V_{vol}-Tai
		41	Lex + *no*-Nai *ka*
		56	A-Ba A-i *hodo* + Lex
		65	V-Ru\ *beki*-Nai *ka*
	45	19	V_{imp}-Te-Oku-Tai
		20	Lex + N-Da
		33	Lex + N-Da
		49	Lex + (Lex)V-Te-Iru-Yō
		63	(Lex)NA-Te
	46	62	V-Ta *dake*-Ta
	48	8	Lex + N-Da-\

On the basis of this compilation of speech intention act tokens, the linguistic realization forms found in the single acts can be grouped into preliminary linguistic realization form types as follows:

(1)   Total number of tokens for linguistic realization form types for speech intention type 30

(1a)   – Lex: 5

(1b)   – *mono*-Nai: 2

(1c)   – *dake / shika*-Nai: 3

(1d)   – Darō / Aru-Yō: 3

(1e)   – *ba\ / to* (V-Ru): 2

(1f)   – V-Ru / V-Te-Iru / V-Ta: 5

(2)   Total number of tokens for linguistic realization form types for speech intention type 40

(2a)   – Lex: 6

(2b)　– A-*hodo/kore hodo* (+Lex): 3
(2c)　– *dake* (+Lex): 1
(2d)　– *beki*: 4
(2e)　– Nai-Ba Nara-Nai: 1
(2f)　– V_{vol}-Tai/V_{imp}-Te-Oku-Tai: 4
(2g)　– Nai *ka*: 2
(2h)　– Iru-Yō: 1

The types and the actual linguistic realization form tokens are next given in detail and briefly commented on.[6] Tables 5.1 to 5.6 show speech intention type 30 and Tables 6.1 to 6.8 speech intention type 40. The comments give only the main points of the linguistic realization forms in question. Besides cross references for double-listed forms, they contain observations with regard to the linguistic form itself, and, in cases of doubt, an explanation with regard to the speech intention categorization as well as additional discussion on the contrastive relevance of the linguistic realization form with regard to L1 English and/or German. In the comments on the linguistic form, it was endeavoured to identify the status of the linguistic realization form in question in the system of the pragmatic apparatus on the whole.[7]

---

[6] For better readability, the linguistic realization forms in column 4 are given with almost the complete speech intention act context, only slightly shortened, but without punctuation for reasons of the sometimes non-contiguous segment order. The elements which are thought to be speech intention indicators, which are hermeneutically understood as means expressing the speech intention within each speech intention act, are typographically marked in the following way: (a) all lexical and grammatical indicator elements are set in bold, (b) the lexical indicator elements are additionally set in italics, and (c) the lexical units in which the grammatical indicator elements occur are set underlined. The same conventions were applied to the romanized transliteration line and, as far as possible, to the English translation too. Due to the typographical editing conventions of the book, the English translation on the whole is given in italics, so that in the English lines the identification of the lexical items gets lost among the linguistic realization form markers. In addition, in the English translation there are cases of coincidence between the equivalents to independent lexical items (bold italics) and lexical carriers of the grammatical indicators (underlined) of the Japanese original, resulting in "italic-bold-underlined" in the translation line, for example, "needs" in Act No. 12.

[7] Thus in the instances starting from the empirical linguistic realization form token in question, additional interpretations based on linguistic competence via introspective observation are given. This should not, however, be taken as a methodological rupture, but as an attempt to hint at future research work to be addressed by empirical studies.

3.1. Results for speech intention type 30

Tab. 5.1: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form type 1a: Lex

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	12	Lex + V-Te-Iru	ソ連とて軍備管理協定は**必要**としている [から] soren tote gunbikanri kyōtei wa ***hitsuyō*** to <u>shite iru</u> [kara] *[since] the S. U **needs** an arms control agreement anyway*
	21	Lex + *mono*-Nai	パーシングⅡや巡航ミサイルも、軍事バランスを**そう変える**ものではない pāshingu-II ya junkō misairu mo, gunji baransu o ***sō kaeru*** mono de wa n<u>ai</u> *the cruise missiles **will not** change the military balance **very much***
	24	Lex + *dake*-Da	世界の安全保障を**危うく**する**だけだ** sekai no anzenhoshō o ***ayauku*** suru *dake* da *[such a tendency] … will do **nothing** but endanger the security of the world*
	37	Lex + V-Ta *no wa* + N-Da	交渉の最大の**ネック**になっ**たのは** [...] パーシングⅡ**である** kōshō no saidai no nekku ni natta **no wa** […] pāshingu-II de aru ***what has** become the most **serious problem** in the negotiations **are** the Pershing II […]*
	46	Lex + N+Aru-Yō	合体した交渉は技術的には**はむずかしい**面も**あろう** [が] gattai shita kōshō wa gijutsuteki ni wa ***muzukashī*** <u>men mo</u> **arō** [ga] *combined negotiations **will probably** produce difficulties, too [, but]*

In act number 12, *hitsuyō to suru* [need] is not per se a clear indicator for speech intention type 30 and could occur in the context of description of objective facts (type 21) too, but it has a strong tendency to be used in an estimation context. For act number 21, a double linguistic realization form was assigned (see type 1b below). The combination of sō+V [V+ so much] and *mono de wa nai* [it is not that] indicates type 31 here. Since sō+V [V+ so much] has itself a strong tendency to type 31, it is listed here under the linguistic realization form of the type Lex. In act number 37, *nekku ni natta* [had become the most serious problem], the construction *no wa… de aru* [what… is…] can be interpreted as a linguistic realization form type of its own. While it is not exclusively an indiciator of the speech intention type 31, it is nevertheless typical for estimation. In act number 46, *muzukashii* [difficult] as a lexical element is considered to have a strong tendency to speech intention type 31, because it usually refers to cognitive estimation patterns; *arō* [there will probably be] is considered to be an indicator of estimation in general.

Tab. 5.2: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form
type 1b: *mono*-Nai

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	21	Lex + *mono*-Nai	パーシングⅡや巡航ミサイルも、軍事バランスを**そう変える**ものではな**い** pāshingu-II ya junkō misairu mo, gunji baransu o **sō kaeru** mono de wa nai *the cruise missiles **will not change** the military balance **very much***
	54	N-wa + *mono*-Nai-\	もともと安定した平和**は**、いわゆる軍事均衡で維持され<u>る</u>**ものではなく** motomoto antei shita heiwa wa, iwayuru gunjikinkō de iji sareru mono de wa naku *stable peace cannot be sustained by the so-called military balance [, but]*

Note that the unit of act 21 (see linguistic realization form type 1a in Table 5.1) is on the whole taken as a cognitive statement of the believed fact that the military balance will not be dramatically changed by the new cruise missiles and Pershing-II (therefore speech intention Subtype 31), and not as a normative statement in the sense that the new missiles are suitable for changing the military balance (which would make it a speech intention of Subtype 46). In act number 54, the interpretation (as cognitive statement of a believed fact) is similar to that of act number 21 above.

Tab. 5.3: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form
type 1c: "*dake/shika*-Nai"

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	24	Lex + *dake*-Da	世界の安全保障を**危うく**する**だけだ** sekai no anzenhoshō o ayauku suru dake da *[such a tendency] … will do **nothing else** but **endanger** the security of the world*
	58	N-*dake* + V-Te	米ソ関係は近年とみに軍事関係**だけ**が残っ**て** beisokankei wa kinnen tomi ni gunjikankei **dake** ga nokot**te** *in U. S.–S. U. relations over the last few years, **nothing but a** military relationship remains [**and**]*
	64	N+*shika* + Nai	主要先進民主主義国のなかで比較的身動きの自由な国も<u>日本とカナダくらい</u>**しかない** shuyō senshinminshushugikoku no naka de hikakuteki miugoki no jiyū na kuni mo <u>nihon to kanada kurai</u> **shika nai**. *among the important leading democracies of the world there <u>are no countries</u> which are quite as free in their movements as <u>Japan and Canada</u>*

Dake [only] and *shika nai* [there is only] as isolated elements are not clear indicators of speech intention subtype 31, but their function of "restric-

tion" with regard to propositional content implies that they have a strong inclination tendency to estimation.

Tab. 5.4: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form type 1d: "Darō/Aru-Yō"

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	13	V-Ru + Da-Yō	いづれは戻ってく**るだろう** [が] izure wa modotte ku**ru** *darō* [ga] *they **will probably** return to negotiations sooner or later [but]*
	46	Lex + N+Aru-Yō	合体した交渉は技術的には**むずかしい**面もあろう [が] gattai shita kōshō wa gijutsuteki ni wa *muzukashii* men mo **arō** [ga] *combined negotiations **will probably** produce **difficulties**, too [, but]*
	50	N+Aru-Yō	このＳＴＡＲＴの場でソ連を交渉に誘う方法や、[…] 　欧州信頼醸成・軍縮会議の場を解きほぐしに活用する方法も**あろう** kono START no ba de soren o kōshō ni sasou hōhō ya […] ōshūshinraijōsei, gunshukukaigi no ba o tokihogushi ni katsuyō suru hōhō mo **arō** *in addition to the method of tempting the Soviet Union to negotiations in the setting of START talks, another method **is** to use the setting of the conference on confidence-building measures and disarmament in Europe […] for finding a solution*

The sentence supplemental *darō* [will probably] and *arō* [there will probably be] are clear indicators for estimations in general (type 30 and 40). The categorization as speech intention type 31 is done here on the basis of the context. The verb form V-Yō is in general considered to be a strong indicator of speech intention types 30 and 40, although they do not exclusively fulfil this function, as they can be used in the initiative sense as well.

Tab. 5.5: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form type 1e: *ba\ / to* (V-Ru)

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	18	pV-Ru *to* V-Ru	米大統領選挙などに巻こまれる**と**、もっとこじれ**る** bei-daitōryōsenkyo nado ni makikomare**ru** *to*, motto kojire**ru** *if [the interruption] … **becomes** entangled with the American presidential elections etc., the situation **will become** even more difficult*
	34	V-Ba\ V-Ru + koto ni Naru	それに上乗せすれ**ば**、交渉再開の機会を遠ざける**ことになる** sore ni uwanose sure **ba**, kōshōsaikai no kikai o tōzakeru koto *ni naru* ***further** increases **would** reduce the chances of a resumption of the negotiations*

Conditional clauses are strongly, though not exclusively, associated with conditioned assertions. Therefore, they are taken as strong indicators of speech intention type 30.

Tab. 5.6: Speech intention type 30 (Subtype 31) and linguistic realization form
type 1f: V-Ru / V-Te-Iru / V-Ta

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
31	55	V-Ru	多角的な相互依存関係の上に成り立つ takakuteki na sōgoizonkankei no ue ni narita**tsu** *[stable peace] **is based** on multilateral interdependency*
	12	Lex + V-Te-Iru	ソ連とて軍備管理協定は必要としている [から] soren tote gunbikanri kyōtei wa ***hitsuyō*** to shite i**ru** [kara] *[since] the S. U **needs** an arms control agreement anyway*
	47	V-Te-Iru	世界の世論は、米ソ交渉の進展を期待している sekai no seron wa, beiso-kōshō no shinten o kitai shite i**ru** *[but] the public opinion of the whole world **hopes** for progress in the American–Soviet negotiations*
	59	V-Te-Iru	全体が先細りになってき**ている** zentai ga sakibosori ni natte kite iru *relations overall **have become** weaker and weaker*
	15	N *de* + V-Ta	双方の政治的メンツのぶつけ合いで中断した [ので] sōhō no seijiteki mentsu no butsukeai **de** chūdan shi**ta** [node] *[since] the negotiations **have been interrupted because of** the clash of the political prestige of both sides*

The linguistic realization form features V-Ru, V-Te-Iru and V-Ta are taken together as one type, because no differentiation between them can be made on the basis of the empirical data. On the whole, these linguistic realization forms are what could be called unmarked forms. V-Ru, V-Te-Iru and V-Ta themselves may very well occur in the context of other speech intention types too.

In summary, we can identify the following linguistic realization forms for the speech intention type 30. The linguistic realization type 1a is an open class type, and it would be highly desirable to produce a list of lexical elements that are strongly or exclusively associated with estimations in general and cognitive estimations (type 30) in particular. In contrast, linguistic realization form type 1f is the unmarked type and on the whole not specific to the speech intention type 30. Between these two extremes are the linguistic realization form types 1b, 1c, 1d and 1e, which are characterized by indicators varying between strong association (type 1b, 1c, 1e) and clear association (type 1d) with speech intention type 30. Whether forms are specific to the speech intention type 30 or also possible for type 40 cannot be answered on the basis of the given empirical data.

3.2. Results for speech intention type 40

Tab. 6.1: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42, 45, 48) and linguistic realization form type 2a: Lex

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	41	Lex + *no*-Nai *ka*	その凍結を検討して**よいのではないか** sono tōketsu o kentō shite *yoi* **no de wa nai ka** *would it not be better to consider freezing these plans?*
45	20	Lex + N-Da	すでに世界的にも欧州でも核は***過剰状態***である sude ni sekaiteki ni mo ōshū de mo kaku wa *kajōjōtai* de a**ru** *both on a global level as well as in Europe, **there is** already a **surplus** of nuclear weapons*
	33	Lex + N-Da	ＳＳ２０がすでに***過剰配備***である**る** SS-20 ga sude ni *kajōhaibi* de a**ru** *there **are** already **too many** SS-20s stationed*
	49	Lex + (Lex)V-Te-Iru-Yō	***頑固さ***の度が***過ぎ***ていよう *gankosa* no do ga *sugite iyō*. *[but] this again **seems to be too obstinate** a position*
	63	(Lex)NA-Te	政治関係重視のトルドー首相の着眼はきわめて***適切で*** seijikankeijūshi no torudō-shushō no chakugan wa kiwamete *tekisetsu* de *the aim of attaching special importance to political relations put forward by Prime Minister Trudeau **is** very **appropriate** [**and**]*
48	8	Lex + N-Da-\	***遺憾***な事態であり ikan na jitai de a**ri** *this is very **regrettable**, [**and**]*

Act number 41 coincides with the linguistic realization form of the type Nai-*ka* (2g, see below). On the whole, this type is the same as analysed for speech intention form 30 above. Whether the intention expressed is of the type 30 or 40 depends on the meaning of the lexical elements used. Since the distinction of the subtypes operates analogously, all subtypes found in the text are grouped together into one linguistic realization type. As with regard to the speech intention type 30, it would be helpful to have exhaustive lists of the vocabulary which can be clearly associated with the speech intention type 40.

Tab. 6.2: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42) and linguistic realization form type 2b: A-*hodo/kore hodo* (+Lex)

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	17	A-i *hodo* + Lex	それは早い**ほどよく** sore wa hayai **hodo** *yoku* *this should happen as soon as possible*

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
	30	*kore hodo* + Lex + V-Ta *no wa* + *hajimete*-Da	安全保障についての考え方がこれ**ほど*四分五裂*になっ*た**__のは*初めてだ*__ anzenhoshō ni tsuite no kangaekata ga kore**hodo** *shibun-goretsu* ni nat**ta** **no wa hajimete da** *it is* __*the first time*__ *that opinions on security questions in Europe have* __**diverged to such** *an extent*__
	56	A-Ba A-i *hodo* + Lex	軍事以外の関係が濃けれ**ば**濃い**ほど*よい*** gunji igai no kankei ga kokere ba koi **hodo** *yoi* __*the closer*__ *the non-military relations,* __**the better**__

Hodo [(to the) extent] is not a speech intention 40 indicator in itself, but since it is used frequently in combination with clear adjectival indicators it is counted here provisionally as a linguistic realization form type on its own. Further investigations on this point are needed.

Tab. 6.3: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 46) and linguistic realization form type 2c: *dake* (+Lex)

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
46	62	V-Ta *dake*-Ta	中曽根首相は原則的に支持し__*た***だけ**__だった nakasone-shushō wa gensokuteki ni __shiji shi__**ta** *dake* datta __**all** *Prime Minister Nakasone* __**did** *was to support*__ *this proposal in principle*__

The same point as mentioned above with regard to *dake* [only] in the context of speech intention type 30 context (see type 1c) can be made here. *Dake* itself is not a clear indicator, but has a strong tendency to estimations through its semantic function of "restriction" with regard to propositional content. It is not specific for type 40 but for estimation in general (both types 30 and 40).

Tab. 6.4: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42) and linguistic realization form type 2d: *beki*

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	14	V-Ru + *beki*-Da	新しい刺激は双方が控え__**るべきだ**__ atarashii shigeki wa sōhō ga hikae**ru** *beki* **da** *[both sides] should avoid further provocation*
	32	V-Ru\ + *beki*-Da	ソ連は報復核配備を自制**すべきだ** soren wa hōfukukakuhaibi o jisei s**ubeki da** *the Soviet Union* __**should** *refrain from the retaliatory stationing of nuclear weapons*__
	35	V-Ru + *beki*-Da	とくに極東核の増強は慎**むべき*だ*** toku ni kyokutōkaku no zōkyō wa tsutsushi**mu** *beki da* *in particular, a reinforcement of nuclear weapons in the far East* __***must be** avoid***ed***__

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
	65	V-Ru\ *beki*-Nai *ka*	[…] 日本として打てる手を直ちに<u>検討</u>**すべきではないか** […] nihon to shite uteru te o tadachi ni <u>kentō</u> **su***beki* **de wa nai ka** *is it not necessary […]* **for** *Japan to immediately* <u>*examine*</u> *all the possibilities it has?*

Act number 65 coincides with the linguistic realization form of the type Nai-*ka* (see 2g below). *Beki* [should] is specific for Subtype 42 (estimation with regard to importance/relevance) and a clear indicator of speech intention type 40.

Tab. 6.5: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42) and linguistic realization form type 2e: Nai-Ba Nara-Nai

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	16	pV-Nai-Ba Nara-Nai	再開にはきっかけが<u>用意</u>**されねばならぬ** saikai ni wa kikkake ga <u>yōi</u> ***sare ne ba nara nu*** *an opportunity* <u>***must be***</u> <u>*provided*</u> *to make a resumption possible*

Like *beki* [should], … *nakere ba naranai* [must] and all semantically similar forms are clear indicators of the speech intention Subtype 42.

Tab. 6.6: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42, 45) and linguistic realization form Type 2f: V_{vol}-Tai/V_{imp}-Te-Oku-Tai

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	9	V_{vol}-Tai	早い機会の再開を**望みたい** hayai kikai no saikai o ***nozomi*tai** *we hope for an early opportunity of resuming [the talks]*
	31	V-Te + V_{vol}-Tai	米ソ双方とも、この軍事秩序崩壊の現状をよく<u>見つめ</u>**てもらいたい** beiso sōhō tomo, kono gunjichitsujohōkai no genjō o yoku <u>mitsume</u>**te *morai*tai** *our **wish is** that both the U. S. and S. U. will carefully* <u>*observe*</u> *the present situation of collapse of the military order*
	36	V_{vol}-Tai	レーガン米大統領の弾力的な新提案を***期待*したい** rēgan bei-daitōryō no danryokuteki na shinteian o ***kitai shitai*** *we hope for a new flexible proposal from U. S. President Reagan*
45	19	V_{imp}-Te-Oku-Tai	配備が切り札という発想法を再び***戒めておきたい*** haibi ga kirifuda to iu hassōhō o futatabi ***imashimete okitai*** *we **would like to warn** [the West] once more **against** considering the stationing as a trump-card*

This linguistic realization type, that is, the morpho-semantic combination of the literal expression of "wish/want" with volitive or imperative verbs in the context of estimations is rather unusual in English or German and leads to the effect of a high degree of markedness if translated literally. It thus appears to be rather specific to Japanese and is therefore a very interesting type of linguistic realization forms because of its contrast *vis-à-vis* English or German.

Tab. 6.7: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 42) and linguistic realization form type 2g Nai *ka*

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
42	41	Lex + *no*-Nai *ka*	その凍結を検討して**よいのではないか** sono tōketsu o kentō shite ***yoi* no de wa nai ka** ***would it not be better*** *to consider freezing these plans?*
	65	V-Ru \ *beki*-Nai *ka*	[...] 日本として打てる手を直ちに検討**すべきではないか** [...] nihon to shite uteru te o tadachi ni <u>kentō</u> s**u***beki* **de wa nai ka** ***is it not necessary*** [...] ***for*** *Japan to immediately <u>examine</u> all the possibilities it has?*

Act number 41 coincides with the lexical realization type Lex (see Type 2a) and number 65 with the type *beki* (see Type 2d). *Nai ka* (negation + question-marker) is one more interesting linguistic realization form type with regard to its contrastive relevance for English or German as L1. Of course, from the formal point of view, there is the quite similar form of "rhetorical question" in English, German, and other Indo-European languages, but in English or German this form of stating an opinion or making a statement is highly marked and statistically not very frequent. In contrast, the Japanese form in question abounds, in everyday spoken Japanese in particular, and it is also productive in combination with the modal extension *to omoimasu* [I think that]. With regard to its actual usage, this Japanese linguistic realization form is therefore considered to correspond to German or English non-interrogative forms with modal adverbs or particles as additional lexical elements. While there are similar modal adverbs and particles in Japanese, the actual use and the frequency of specific combinations of certain form elements with regard to specific communicative functions differ. Further investigation of this Japanese linguistic realization form and its actual equivalents with regard to function in English and/or German is highly desirable.

Tab. 6.8: Speech intention type 40 (Subtype 45) and linguistic realization form type 2h: Iru-Yō

Subtype	Act No.	Feature	Linguistic realization form
45	49	Lex + (Lex)V-Te-Iru-Yoo	**頑固さ**の度が**過ぎ**ていよう *gankosa* no do ga **_sugite iyō_**. *[but] this again **_seems to_** be too **obstinate** a position*

Act number 49 coincides with the linguistic realization type Lex (see Type 2a). The Iru-Yō-type corresponds to the Darō/Aru-Yō-type listed in the section for speech intention type 30 (Type 1d). This means that, in its epistemic use, V-Yō is not specific to the speech intention type 30, but is associated with estimation in general (both types 30 and 40).

Let us summarize the results for the linguistic realization forms for the speech intention type 40. The linguistic realization type 2a is, similar to 1a with type 30, an open class type. Further linguistic work on the compilation of exhaustive lists for this linguistic realization type would thus be desirable for foreign language teaching. Type 2b and 2c contain special lexical elements, which in combination with Lex have a reinforcement function and work as strong indicators of the speech intention type 40. Type 2d and 2e, *beki* [should] and *nakere ba naranai* [must], as well as 2h (Iru-Yō) are clear indicators of type 40. In the same way, type 2f (V_{vol}-Tai) and 2g (Nai-ka, in its use as intention indicator) are of interest with regard to their contrastive relevance.

4. Some conclusions for JFL

The grammatical and lexical elements of the linguistic realization form types discussed here are well known by any experienced teacher of JFL. However, the issue of which elements actually occur with what frequency, in which combinations and with which functions is less well known. In order to be as effective as possible, language teachers' knowledge should not be restricted to the level of information about linguistic forms and form varieties as single units, but should include the functional aspect in the sense of speech act theory, too. The point here is that, just as in other linguistic fields such as morphology and syntax, the native or native-like unconscious linguistic competence of the teacher should be enlarged and transformed into a conscious linguistic competence based on knowledge about speech acts. Such knowledge should include clear-cut and systematic knowledge about the theoretical categories needed to analyse and explain the linguistic phenomena in question. This does not necessarily imply that foreign language teaching should incorporate

more theory in the lessons themselves. On the contrary, in my view, JFL lessons should be as concrete and practical as possible. The idea for the application of the results of the research carried out in speech act theory in the classroom is that (1) an understanding of the basic intentional categories in speech activity, the speech intention types, on the part of both teachers and students is included; and that (2) teaching materials provide an understanding of linguistic realization forms as well as lists of actual forms for each speech intention type needed for the communicative targets of the class in question.[8] Furthermore, (3) systematic training in these linguistic realization forms, paying attention to the communicative needs of the students should be the objective of foreign language teaching.

Needless to say, much work remains to be done to achieve these aims, and the present analysis provides only a preliminary attempt to show the direction that future work in applied linguistics with regard to foreign language learning, in this case JFL, could take. If more and broader studies along these lines are conducted, they could result in theoretically more clear-cut models of virtual speech intention types, and, what is more, in precise information about which linguistic realization forms are actually possible for which speech intention type, thereby highlighting the relevance of these linguistic realization forms with regard to the differences between L1 and L2.

---

[8] A study in this direction, though with the background of a quite different methodological approach, is Schilling (1999), which deals with directives.

APPENDIX I: TEXT ANALYZED

ASAHI SHINBUN (25.11.1983): SHASETSU [EDITORIAL].

(Par. 0)

[JP]	(1) ＩＮＦ 交渉を再開させるには (1) //
[RM]	(1) INF-kōshō o saikai saseru ni wa (1) //
[EN]	(1) Towards a resumption of INF negotiations (1) //

(Par. 1)

[JP]	(2) /(3) ジネーブで行われていた (3)/ 米ソの欧州中距離
[RM]	(2) /(3) jinēbu de okonowarete ita (3)/ beiso no ōshū chūkyori
[EN]	(2) The negotiations between the U. S. and the S. U. on the restriction of European intermediate range

[JP]	核戦力（ＩＮＦ）制限交渉が中断した。(2) //
[RM]	kakusenryoku (INF) seigenkōshō ga chūdan shita. (2) //
[EN]	nuclear forces (INF) /(3) held in Geneva (3)/ have been interrupted. (2) //

[JP]	(4) 西独連邦議会が、米新型核配備決議案を可決したのに
[RM]	(4) seidoku renpōgikai ga, bei shingatakakuhaibi ketsugian o kaketsu shita no ni
[EN]	(4) As a result of the West German Bundestag passing a motion to

[JP]	ともない、(4) //		(5) ソ連側は
[RM]	tomonai, (4) //		(5) sorengawa wa
[EN]	station the new American nuclear weapons (4) //		(5) the Soviet side,

[JP]	/(6) 「配備すれば中断する」との予告に従って、(6)/
[RM]	/(6) "haibi sure ba chūdan suru" to no yokoku ni shitagatte, (6)/
[EN]	/(6) in line with to their previous warning: "If weapons will be stationed, negotiations will be interrupted", (6)/

[JP]	「 /(7) 再開の日程を決めることなく、(7)/
[RM]	" /(7) saikai no nittei o kimeru koto naku, (7)/
[EN]	declared: " /(7) There will be no schedule for new talks, (7)/

[JP]	現ラウンドの話し合いを続けない」と表明したのである。(5) //
[RM]	genraundo no hanashiai o tsuzuke nai" to hyōmei shita no de aru. (5) //
[EN]	and the current round will not be continued". (5) //

[JP]	(8) 遺憾な事態であり、(8) //		(9) 早い機会の再開を望みたい。(9) //
[RM]	(8) ikan na jitai de ari, (8) //		(9) hayai kikai no saikai o nozomitai. (9) //
[EN]	(8) This is very regrettable, (8) //		(9) and we hope for an early opportunity of resuming the talks. (9) //

(Par. 2)

[JP]	(10) 西側は早期再開の楽観説を流し、(10) //
[RM]	(10) nishigawa wa sōkisaikai no rakkansetsu o nagashi, (10) //
[EN]	(10) While the West is optimistic of the talks resuming very soon, (10) //

[JP]	(11) ソ連側はこれを否定している。(11) //	(12) ソ連とて軍備管理
[RM]	(11) sorengawa wa kore o hitei shite iru. (11) //	(12) soren tote gunbikanri
[EN]	(11) the S.U. denies. (11) //	(12) Since the S.U. needs an

[JP]	協定は必要としているから、(12) //	(13) いづれは戻ってくるだろう
[RM]	kyōtei wa hitsuyō to shite iru kara, (12) //	(13) izure wa modotte kuru darō
[EN]	arms control agreement anyway, (12) //	(13) they will probably return to

[JP]	が、(13) //	(14) 中断期間を短くするため、
[RM]	ga, (13) //	(14) chūdankikan o mijikaku suru tame,
[EN]	negotiations sooner or later, (13) //	(14) but in order to keep the time of interruption

[JP]	新しい刺激は双方が控えるべきだ。(14) //
[RM]	atarashii shigeki wa sōhō ga hikaeru beki da. (14) //
[EN]	short, both sides should avoid further provocations. (14) //

[JP]	(15) 双方の政治的メンツのぶつけ合いで中断したので、(15) //
[RM]	(15) sōhō no seijiteki mentsu no butsukeai de chūdan shita node, (15) //
[EN]	(15) Since the negotiations have been interrupted because of the clash of both sides' political prestige, (15) //

[JP]	(16) 再開にはきっかけが用意されねばならぬ。(16) //
[RM]	(16) saikai ni wa kikkake ga yōi sare ne ba nara nu. (16) //
[EN]	(16) an opportunity must be provided to make a resumption possible. (16) //

[JP]	(17) それは早いほどよく、(17) //	(18) 中断が長びいて、
[RM]	(17) sore wa hayai hodo yoku, (17) //	(18) chūdan ga nagabiite,
[EN]	(17) This should happen as soon as possible, (17) //	(18) because if the interruption

[JP]	米大統領選挙などに巻こまれると、もっとこじれる。(18) //
[RM]	bei-daitōryōsenkyo nado ni makikomareru to, motto kojireru. (18) //
[EN]	goes on and becomes entangled with the American presidential elections etc., the situation will become even more difficult. (18) //

(Par. 3)

[JP]	(19) まず西側に、配備が切り札という発想法を再び
[RM]	(19) mazu nishigawa ni, haibi ga kirifuda to iu hassōhō o futatabi
[EN]	(19) First we would like to warn the West once more against considering the

[JP]	戒めておきたい。(19) //	(20) すでに世界的にも欧州でも
[RM]	imashimete okitai. (19) //	(20) sude ni sekaiteki ni mo ōshū de mo
[EN]	stationing as a trump-card. (19) //	(20) On a global level as well as in Europe

[JP]	核は過剰状態である。(20) //
[RM]	kaku wa kajōjōtai de aru. (20) //
[EN]	there is already a surplus of nuclear weapons. (20) //

[JP]	(21)	/(22) 命中精度抜群
[RM]	(21)	/(22) meichūseido batsugun
[EN]	(21) Even the Pershing II,	/(22) which is believed to have outstanding

[JP]	といわれる (22) /	パーシング ⅠⅠや巡航ミサイルも、	軍事バランスを
[RM]	to iwareru (22) /	pāshingu-II ya junkō misairu mo,	gunji baransu o
[EN]	accuracy, (22) /	and the cruise missiles will not change	the military balance

[JP]	そう変えるものではない。(21) //	(23) ソ連側も潜水艦・
[RM]	sō kaeru mono de wa nai. (21) //	(23) sorengawa mo sensuikan,
[EN]	very much. (21) //	(23) There are reports saying that the S.U.

[JP]	空中発射巡航ミサイルを開発中と伝えられる。(23) //
[RM]	kūchūhassha junkō misairu o kaihatsuchū to tsutaerareru. (23) //
[EN]	too, is developing submarine- and air-to-ground cruise missiles. (23) //

[JP]	(24) こういう拡大均衡指向は、世界の安全保障を
[RM]	(24) kō iu kakudaikinkōshikō wa, sekai no anzenhoshō o
[EN]	(24) Such a trend towards a balance of armaments will do nothing but

[JP]	危うくするだけだ。(24) //
[RM]	ayauku suru dake da. (24) //
[EN]	endanger the security of the world. (24) //

(Par. 4)

[JP]	(25) 西側同盟諸国内の世論は、	多数が
[RM]	(25) nishigawadōmeishokokunai no seron wa,	tasū ga
[EN]	(25) Public opinion in the countries of the western alliance is	in the majority

[JP]	米新型核配備に反対である。(25) //　　　　　　　　　　　　(26) 欧州の
[RM]	bei-shingatakakuhaibi ni hantai de aru. (25) //　　　(26) ōshū no
[EN]	against stationing the new American weapons. (25) //　　(26) The neutral

[JP]	中立諸国も配備反対である。(26) //　　　　　　　　(27) 東側でも
[RM]	chūritsushokoku mo haibihantai de aru. (26) //　(27) higashigawa de mo
[EN]	European states are against the stationing too. (26) //　(27) In the East too,

[JP]	教会などを中心に、反核運動が胎動し、(27) //
[RM]	kyōkai nado o chūshin ni, hankaku undō ga taidō shi, (27) //
[EN]	an anti-nuclear movement is beginning to develop, e. g. around the churches, (27) //

[JP]	(28) ルーマニアは核対決に独自の立場をとっている。(28) //
[RM]	(28) rūmania wa kakutaiketsu ni dokuji no tachiba o totte iru. (28) //
[EN]	(28) and Romania takes a quite independent position on the question of nuclear confrontation. (28) //

[JP]	(29) 東独やチェコスロバキアも、ソ連の報復核配備を
[RM]	(29) tōdoku ya chekosurobakia mo, soren no hōfukukakuhaibi o
[EN]	(29) Neither do East Germany or Czechoslovakia welcome the Soviet

[JP]	歓迎しているわけではない。(29) //
[RM]	kangei shite iru wake de wa nai. (29) //
[EN]	retaliatory stationing of nuclear weapons. (29) //

[JP]	(30) 第二次大戦以後、欧州で安全保障についての考え方が
[RM]	(30) dainijitaisen igo, ōshū de anzenhoshō ni tsuite no kangaekata ga
[EN]	(30) It is the first time since the Second World War that

[JP]	これほど四分五裂になったのは初めてだ。(30) //
[RM]	korehodo shibungoretsu ni natta no wa hajimete da. (30) //
[EN]	opinions on security questions in Europe have diverged to such an extent. (30) //

[JP]	(31) 米ソ双方とも、この軍事秩序崩壊の現状をよく見つめて
[RM]	(31) beiso sōhō tomo, kono gunjichitsujohōkai no genjō o yoku mitsumete
[EN]	(31) Our wish is that both the U. S. and S. U. will carefully observe the present

[JP]	もらいたい。(31) //
[RM]	moraitai. (31) //
[EN]	situation of collapse of the military order. (31) //

(Par. 5)

[JP]	(32) ソ連は報復核配備を自制すべきだ。(32) //
[RM]	(32) soren wa hōfukukakuhaibi o jisei subeki da. (32) //
[EN]	(32) The S. U. should refrain from the retaliatory stationing of nuclear weapons. (32) //

[JP]	(33) ＳＳ２０がすでに過剰配備である。(33) //	(34) それに上乗せすれ
[RM]	(33) SS-20 ga sude ni kajōhaibi de aru. (33) //	(34) sore ni uwanose sure
[EN]	(33) There are already too many SS-20 stationed. (33) //	(34) Further increases

[JP]	ば、交渉再開の機会を遠ざけることになる。(34) //
[RM]	ba, kōshōsaikai no kikai o tōzakeru koto ni naru. (34) //
[EN]	would reduce the chances of a resumption of the negotiations. (34) //

[JP]	(35) とくに極東核の増強は慎むべきだ。(35) //
[RM]	(35) toku ni kyokutōkaku no zōkyō wa tsutsushimu beki da. (35) //
[EN]	(35) In particular, a reinforcement of nuclear weapons in the far East must be avoided. (35) //

(Par. 6)

[JP]	(36) このソ連側の自制を前提に、レーガン米大統領の
[RM]	(36) kono sorengawa no jisei o zentei ni, rēgan bei-daitōryō no
[EN]	(36) Assuming this self-restraint on the part of the S. U., we hope for a new flexible

[JP]	弾力的な新提案を期待したい。(36) //	(37) 交渉の最大のネックになった
[RM]	danryokuteki na shinteian o kitai shitai. (36) //	(37) kōshō no saidai no nekku ni nat-ta
[EN]	proposal from U.S. President Reagan. (36) //	(37) What has become the most serious problem in the negotiations

[JP]	のは、/(38) ソ連側が指揮通信組織を先制攻撃で破壊されると
[RM]	no wa, /(38) sorengawa ga shikitsūshinsoshiki o senseikōgeki de hakai sareru to
[EN]	are the Pershing II, /(38) to which the S. U. objects arguing that they are able to destroy their

[JP]	反発した (38) /	パーシングⅡである。(37) //
[RM]	hanpatsu shita (38) /	pāshingu-II de aru. (37) //
[EN]	communication networks in a preventive strike. (38)/(37) //	

[JP]	(39) これまでのレーガン提案には、パーシングⅡの大幅削減も
[RM]	(39) kore made no rēgan teian ni wa, pāshingu-II no ōhabasakugen mo
[EN]	(39) Up to now, Reagan's disarmament proposals have included a drastic

[JP]	含んでいる。(39) //	(40) 初年度の配備予定は九基だが、(40) //
[RM]	fukunde iru. (39) //	(40) shonendo no haibiyotei wa kyūki da ga, (40) //
[EN]	reduction of Pershing II. (39) //	(40) Now, in the first year of stationing nine launching pads are planned, (40) //

[JP]	(41) その凍結を検討してよいのではないか。(41) //
[RM]	(41) sono tōketsu o kentō shite yoi no de wa nai ka. (41) //
[EN]	(41) but would it not be better to consider freezing these plans? (41) //

(Par. 7)

[JP]	(42) 国連第一委員会で二十二日、ＩＮＦ 関係で四つの決議が
[RM]	(42) kokuren daiichi-iinkai de nijūninichi, INF-kankei de yottsu no ketsugi ga
[EN]	(42) On 22nd, four resolutions concerning INF passed the UN

[JP]	通過した。(42) //	(43) うち圧倒的に票を集めたのは
[RM]	tsūka shita. (42) //	(43) uchi attōteki ni hyō o atsumeta no wa
[EN]	committee 1. (42) //	(43) The one which obtained an overwhelming majority was

[JP]	メキシコ、スウェーデン両国提出の、	/(44) ＩＮＦ と戦略兵器
[RM]	mekishiko, suēden ryōkoku teishutsu no,	/(44) INF to senryakuheiki
[EN]	the motion proposed by Mexico and Sweden	/(44) to combine INF negotiations

[JP]	削減交渉（ＳＴＡＲＴ）を合体し、(44) /
[RM]	sakugenkōshō (START) o gattai shi, (44) /
[EN]	and the negotiations about a reduction of strategic weapons (44) /

[JP]	/(45) 戦術核も含めて討議する (45) /	案だった。(43) //
[RM]	/(45) senjutsukaku mo fukumete tōgi suru (45) /	an datta. (43) //
[EN]	/(45) and to discuss them including tactical nuclear weapons.	(45)/(43) //

[JP]	(46) 合体した交渉は技術的にはむずかしい面もあろうが、(46) //
[RM]	(46) gattai shita kōshō wa gijutsuteki ni wa muzukashii men mo arō ga, (46) //
[EN]	(46) Combined negotiations will probably produce difficulties, too, (46) //

[JP]	(47) 世界の世論は、米ソ交渉の進展を期待
[RM]	(47) sekai no seron wa, beiso-kōshō no shinten o kitai
[EN]	(47) but the public opinion of the whole world hopes for progress in the American-

[JP]	している。(47) // (48) 米国だけがこの決議に反対
[RM]	shite iru. (47) // (48) beikoku dake ga kono ketsugi ni hantai
[EN]	Soviet negotiations. (47) // (48) Only the U.S. voted against

[JP]	したが、(48) // (49) 頑固さの度が過ぎていよう。(49) //
[RM]	shita ga, (48) // (49) gankosa no do ga sugite iyō. (49) //
[EN]	this motion, (48) // (49) but this again seems to be too obstinate a position. (49) //

(Par. 8)

[JP]	(50) この START の場でソ連を交渉に誘う方法や、
[RM]	(50) kono START no ba de soren o kōshō ni sasou hōhō ya,
[EN]	(50) In addition to the method of tempting the S. U. to negotiations in the setting of

[JP]	/(51) 来年一月からストックホルムで開かれる (51) / 欧州信頼醸成、
[RM]	/(51) rainen ichigatsu kara sutokkuhorumu de hirakareru (51) / ōshūshin-raijōsei,
[EN]	the START talks, another method would be to use the setting of the

[JP]	軍縮会議の場を解きほぐしに活用する方法もあろう。(50) //
[RM]	gunshukukaigi no ba o tokihogushi ni katsuyō suru hōhō mo arō. (50) //
[EN]	conference on confidence- building measures and disarmament in Europe /(51) starting in January next year in Stockholm (51) / for finding a solution. (50) //

(Par. 9)

[JP]	(52) ところで交渉中断に備えて、西独は東側との
[RM]	(52) tokoro de kōshō chūdan ni sonaete, seidoku wa higashigawa to no
[EN]	(52) Now, in preparation for an interruption of the negotiations, West Germany has

[JP]	協力、相互依存関係強化に手を打ち、(52) //
[RM]	kyōryoku, sōgoizonkankeikyōka ni te o uchi, (52) //
[EN]	initiated cooperation and an intensification of interdependency with the East, (52) //

[JP]	(53) サッチャー英首相も近くハンガリー訪問の予定である。(53) //
[RM]	(53) sattchā eishushō mo chikaku hangarīhōmon no yotei de aru. (53) //
[EN]	(53) and British Prime Minister Thatcher is also going to visit Hungary soon. (53) //

[JP]	(54) もともと安定した平和は、いわゆる軍事均衡で維持されるもの
[RM]	(54) motomoto antei shita heiwa wa, iwayuru gunjikinkō de iji sareru mono
[EN]	(54) Naturally stable peace can not be sustained by the so-called military

[JP]	ではなく、(54) //	(55) 多角的な相互依存関係の上に成り立つ。(55) //
[RM]	de wa naku (54) //	(55) takakuteki na sōgoizonkankei no ue ni naritatsu. (55) //
[EN]	balance, (54) //	(55) but is based on multilateral interdependency. (55) //

[JP]	(56) 軍事以外の関係が濃ければ濃いほどよい。(56) //	(57) 西欧諸国が
[RM]	(56) gunji igai no kankei ga kokere ba koi hodo yoi. (56) //	(57) seiōshokoku ga
[EN]	(56) The closer the non-military relations, the better. (56) //	(57) Whereas the Western

[JP]	こうした対ソ政治関係の補強を重視しているのに、(57) //
[RM]	kō shita taiso-seijikankei no hokyō o jūshi shite iru no ni, (57) //
[EN]	European countries are attaching much importance to reinforcing such political relations with the S.U., (57) //

[JP]	(58) 米ソ関係は近年とみに軍事関係だけが残って、(58) //
[RM]	(58) beisokankei wa kinnen tomi ni gunjikankei dake ga nokotte, (58) //
[EN]	(58) in U.S.–S. U. relations over the last few years nothing remains but a military relationship, (58) //

[JP]	(59) 全体が先細りになってきている。(59) //
[RM]	(59) zentai ga sakibosori ni natte kite iru. (59) //
[EN]	(59) and relations overall have become weaker and weaker. (59) //

(Par. 10)

[JP]	(60) 先日、カナダのトルドー首相が来日し、(60) //
[RM]	(60) senjitsu, kanada no torudō-shushō ga rainichi shi, (60) //
[EN]	(60) When the Canadian Prime Minister Trudeau came to Japan recently, (60) //

[JP]	(61) 緊張緩和のため政治対話の促進など四項目の
[RM]	(61) kinchōkanwa no tame seijitaiwa no sokushin nado yonkōmoku no
[EN]	(61) he made a four-point disarmament proposal including the intensification of

[JP]	軍縮提言したが、(61) //	(62) 中曽根首相は
[RM]	gunshukuteigen shita ga, (61) //	(62) nakasone-shushō wa
[EN]	political dialogue on detention, (61) //	(62) but all Prime Minister Nakasone

[JP]	原則的に支持しただけだった。(62) //
[RM]	gensokuteki ni shiji shita dake datta. (62) //
[EN]	did was to support this proposal in principle. (62) //

[JP]	(63) だが政治関係重視のトルドー首相の着眼はきわめて
[RM]	(63) da ga seijikankeijūshi no torudō-shushō no chakugan wa kiwamete
[EN]	(63) But the aim of attaching special importance to political relations put forward

[JP]	適切で、(63) //
[RM]	tekisetsu de, (63) //
[EN]	by Prime Minister Trudeau is very appropriate, (63) //

[JP]	(64) 主要先進民主主義国のなかで比較的身動きの
[RM]	(64) shuyō senshinminshushugikoku no naka de hikakuteki miugoki no
[EN]	(64) and among the important leading democracies of the world there are no

[JP]	自由な国も日本とカナダくらいしかない。(64) //
[RM]	jiyū na kuni mo nihon to kanada kurai shika nai. (64) //
[EN]	countries which are quite as free in their movements as Japan and Canada. (64) //

(Par. 11)

[JP]	(65) ＩＮＦ 交渉再開の環境づくりに、また米ソ政治対話促進に、
[RM]	(65) INF-kōshōsaikai no kankyōzukuri ni, mata beiso-seijitaiwasokushin ni,
[EN]	(65) Is it not necessary, in order to bring about a new environment for taking up INF negotiations again and to accelerate the political U. S.-S. U. dialogue,

[JP]	日本として打てる手を直ちに検討すべきではないか。(65) //
[RM]	nihon to shite uteru te o tadachi ni kentō subeki de wa nai ka. (65) //
[EN]	for Japan to immediately examine all the possibilities it has? (65) //

APPENDIX II: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

(1) VERBS (V):

V-Ru = V informal/present, all V-types (食べる *taberu*, 行く *iku*, 来る *kuru* etc.)

V-Ta = V informal/past, all types (食べた *tabeta*, 行った *itta*, 来た *kita* etc.)

V-Nai = V negated //informal/present, all types (食べない *tabenai*, 行かない *ikanai* etc.)
(including variation forms such as ~ なければ *nakereba* and ~ ねば *neba* for the V-Nai-Ba combination)

V-Te = V in *te*-form, all verb types (食べて *tabete*, 行って *itte* etc.)

V-Tai = *tai*-form of V, all verb types (食べ たい *tabetai*, 行きたい *ikitai* etc.)

V-Ba = *ba*-form of V, all verb types (食べれば *tabereba*, 行けば *ikeba* etc.)

V-Yoo = *(yo)u*-form of V, all verb types (食べよう *tabeyō*, 行こう *ikō* etc.)

V-\ = semi-finite form of V, all verb types (食べ *tabe*, 行き *iki* etc.)

pV = passive form of V (食べられる *taberareru*, 行かれる *ikareru* etc.)

V$_{quo}$ = quotational verb (言う *iu*, 伝える *tsutaeru*, 表明する *hyōmei suru* etc.)

V$_{imp}$ = imperative verb (戒める *imashimeru* etc.)

V$_{vol}$ = volitional verb (望む *nozomu*, 期待する *kitai suru*, etc.)

(2) A<small>DJECTIVES</small> (A):

A-i = A informal/present (速い *hayai* etc.)

A-Ta = A informal/past (速かった *hayakatta* etc.)

A-Nai = A negated//informal/present (速くない *hayaku nai* etc.)

A-Te = *te*-form of A (速くて *hayakute* etc.)

A-Ba = *ba*-form of A (速ければ *hayakereba* etc.)

(3) N<small>OUNS</small> (N):

N-Da = N informal/present (covers N だ N *da* and N である N *de aru*)

N-Ta = N informal/past (N だった N *datta* and N であった N *de atta*)

N-Nai = N negated//informal/present (Nではない N *de wa nai* and Nでない N *de nai*)

N-Te = N with *te*-form of the copula (N で N *de*)

N-Ba = N with *ba*-form of the copula (N であれば N *de areba*)

N$_{quo}$ = quotational noun (… との予告 … *to no yokoku* etc.)

N. B. for Nominal Adjectives (NA):

No tokens in the text; schematically, the formulae for NA would be written by analogy to the conventions of notation for N, i. e. NA-Da, NA-Ta

R<small>EFERENCES</small>

Adachi, Taro (1999): *Nihongo gimonbun ni okeru handan no shosō* [Aspects of Judgement in Japanese Interrogative Sentences]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Akatsuka, Noriko and Atsuro Tsubomoto (1998): *Modariti to hatsuwakōi* [Modality and Speech Acts]. Tokyo: Kenkyūsha.

Aihara, Yutaka (1999): *Nihongo no kinōkōzō* [Function Structure in Japanese]. Tokyo: Kuroshio Shuppan.

Austin, John L. (1975): *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd edition, James O. Urmson and Marina Sbisa (eds.). Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kaiser, Stefan, Yasuko Ichikawa, Noriko Kobayashi and Hirofumi Yama-moto (2001): *Japanese: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Makino, Seiichi and Michio Tsutsui (1986): *A Dictionary of Basic Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

—— (1995): *A Dictionary of Intermediate Japanese Grammar*. Tokyo: The Japan Times.

Nitta, Yoshio (2002): Bunkōzō no kyūmei – chinjutsuron kara bun no kaisō kōzōkan e [Investigations in the Structure of Sentence. From the Theory of Statements to the View of Stratified Sentence Structure]. In: *Gekkan gengo* [Monthly Language] 31, 6, pp. 50–61.

Sadock, Jerrold M. (1994): Toward a Grammatically Realistic Typology of Speech Acts. In: Savas L. Tsohatzidis. (ed.): *Foundations of Speech Act Theory. Philosophical and Linguistic Perspectives*. London: Routledge, pp. 393–406.

—— (2004): Speech Acts. In: Laurence R. Horn and Gregory Ward (eds.): *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 53–73.

Schilling, Ulrike (1999): *Kommunikative Basisstrategien des Aufforderns: Eine kontrastive Analyse gesprochener Sprache im Deutschen und im Japanischen* [Basic Communicative Strategies of Requesting: a Contrastive Analysis of Spoken Language in German and Japanese]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Searle, John R. (1969): *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—— (1979): A Taxonomy of Illocutionary Acts. In: John R. Searle (ed.): *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1–29.

Steger, Hugo (1987): Sprechintentionen [Speech Intentions]. Revised Unpublished Paper. Freiburg.

—— (1991): Was kontrastieren wir eigentlich in der kontrastiven Pragmatik? Zur Modellierung eines pragmatischen Apparats als tertium comparationis [What Exactly Do We Contrast in Contrastive Pragmatics? On the Modelling of a Pragmatic Apparatus as Tertium Comparationis]. In: Eijiro Iwasaki (ed.): *Begegnung mit dem "Fremden": Grenzen – Traditionen – Vergleiche. Akten des VIII. Internationalen Germanisten-Kongresses (Tokyo 1990)* [Encounter with the "Foreign": Border-lines – Traditions – Comparisons. Proceedings of the 8th International Congress of Germanists (Tokyo 1990)]. Vol. IV. München: Iudicium, pp. 426–437.

Strawson, Peter F. (1964): Intention and Convention in Speech Acts. In: *Philosophical Review* 73, pp. 439–460.

Vanparys, Johan (1994): On Illocutionary Taxonomies. In: Keith Carlon (ed.): *Perspectives on English. Studies in Honour of Professor Emma Vorlat*. Leuven: Peeters, pp. 285–330.

Weigand, Edda (2003): *Sprache als Dialog. Sprechakttaxonomie und kommunikative Grammatik* [Language as Dialogue. Speech Act Taxonomy and Communicative Grammar]. Tübingen: Niemeyer.