下関市立大学論集　第49巻　第3号（2006年1月）

Towards a new approach to Men's Speech research in the Japanese context

—Investigating Men's Speech through Gender and Sexuality—

Kristen Sullivan *

目　次

1. Introduction
2. Gendered Language in Japanese－An overview of current research approaches
3. Sexuality, Gender and Gendered Language in Japanese
4. Japanese Men's Speech
5. Hegemonic Masculinity and Heterosexuality in the Japanese Context
6. Male Homosexuality in the Japanese Context－The Importance of Nomenclature
   6-1. *Onē* and *onē kotoba*
7. Conclusion

1. Introduction

This article will discuss the developing field of men's speech research in the Japanese context. Women's speech and the discourse of *onna kotoba* [women's language] have been thoroughly researched in the field of gendered language studies in Japanese. However, even a cursory survey of the literature reveals that men's speech and linguistic negotiations remain largely un-researched. This trend is not specific to the Japanese language literature, but is locatable across the wider language and gender discipline, and the field of gender studies in general (Johnson and Meinhof 1997). This is connected to the common correlation of "gender studies" with "women's issues". Some researchers suggest that "women have to work harder at inhabiting social categories than do men" (Shibamoto Smith 2004: 126 citing Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1995). Without entering into a larger debate into this claim, this paper suggests that we should not assume that discourses of gender and sexuality do not work in the regulation of men's use of gendered language in the Japanese context. Through a discussion of the literature, this paper will highlight the importance of investigating the emerging field of men's speech studies through the analytical categories of sexuality and gender, which have been widely discussed in the humanities and recently applied in the field of linguistics. I suggest that there is a need for awareness regarding these issues when investigating men's speech in the Japanese context.

2. Gendered Language in Japanese－An overview of current research approaches

Gendered language in Japanese has been the subject of extensive popular and academic enquiry. The Japanese language is widely documented as having a distinct women's language [*onna kotoba* or *joseigo*] and men's language [*otoko kotoba* or *danseigo*] traditionally glossed as the exclusive speech patterns of women and men, respectively.[1] *Onna kotoba* is widely described as "polite, gentle, soft-spoken, non-assertive, and empathetic" (Shigeko Okamoto 1995: 298) in contrast to *otoko kotoba* which is generally

＊下関市立大学常勤嘱託講師

characterized as being "authoritative, assertive, direct, rough and aggressive" (Sturtz 2001: 2). These are characteristics *supposedly* reflective of Japanese women and men.

However, research into gendered language in Japanese has transformed considerably over the past two decades and our understanding of these linguistic features has also shifted. Recent research in the Japanese language field has emerged in many ways from a critique of the monolithic categories of *onna kotoba* and *otoko kotoba*, and stereotypes of a homogenous speaking community of Japanese women and men presented by previous research models (Okamoto 1995: 300). Current research instead approaches *onna kotoba* and *otoko kotoba* as "ideological constructs rather than observable categories" (Rose and Sharma 2002: 6).

A key principle in this new research agenda is the investigation of the gap between ideology and local linguistic practices, through an examination of linguistic diversity (Eckert and McConnell-Ginet 1992). Such research has located empirical evidence that many women rarely use elements of speech typically associated with *onna kotoba* and, moreover, often employ elements of so-called 'men's speech' (Matsumoto 1996, 2002; Okamoto 1995, 1996). In order to re-examine 'unconventional' linguistic choices out of the limiting sphere of 'deviance', researchers such as Yoshiko Matsumoto (1996) have stressed that there is a "greater role for the speaker's agency than is often recognized." Shigeko Okamoto (1995: 312) adds to this, writing that "the choice of speech styles or certain linguistic forms can be considered a matter of the speaker's 'strategic choice', based on the kind of pragmatic meanings she or he wishes to convey."

Okamoto (cited in Maree 2003) notes that gendered language has typically been understood within a "one-to-one relationship of gender to speech." However, recent reconceptualizations of gendered pronouns and SFPs[2] in terms of indexicality have disrupted such static and narrow understandings. It is now widely recognized that "few features of language directly and exclusively index gender," but rather index a style of speech which may indirectly index gender (Ochs 1992: 340). Elinor Ochs (1992: 342) argues that we must approach the meanings of (gender) indexicals as the complicated intersection of language structures, their pragmatic meanings and social and cultural norms. This suggests that the meaning of gendered language is not static, but multiple and ultimately dependent upon the context of the speech act. Drawing from this notion of indexicality, recent research provides new understandings of gendered language as a creative device used by speakers to construct multiple—not necessarily gendered—identities and relationships and to achieve ideological and pragmatic purposes.

3. Sexuality, Gender and Gendered Language in Japanese

While current research in the field has done much to disrupt stereotypes regarding men's and women's use of gendered language, some researchers suggest that the dominant understanding of gender in the field should also be critically engaged with. Researchers such as Claire Maree (2000: 215) argue that sexuality and a critical awareness of heteronormativity[3] need to be incorporated into the language and gender field at large. By heteronormativity, Maree is referring to the 'commonsense' assumption that sex, gender and sexuality are intrinsically related. That is, a biological woman will be feminine and desire masculine men, and vice versa (Salih 2002: 46). Through the system of heteronormativity, heterosexuality is "promote[d] and produce[d]... as natural, self-evident, desirable, privileged and necessary" (Cameron and Kulick 2003: 55).

The conflation of gender and sexuality is a key element in the maintenance of compulsory heterosexuality (Maree 2000: 215). As Deborah Cameron and Don Kulick (2003: 72) argue, "a performance of heterosexuality must always be in some sense a performance of gender, because heterosexuality requires gender differentiation." Maree argues that the understanding of gender as heterogender in the literature means that the categories of 'man' and 'woman' as natural, fixed and static, as well as the naturalization of heterosexuality, remain unproblematized.

Maree's critical understanding of gender, sexuality and gendered language use is influenced by Judith Butler's theory of 'gender performativity'. Borrowing from Derrida's notion of 'citationality', Butler (1993: 232) rereads femininity as "not the product of a choice, but the forcible citation of a norm, one whose complex historicity is indissociable from relations of discipline, regulation, punishment." Through her application of Butler, Maree argues that the use of gendered language is not the reflection or expression of a stable, innate gender identity, but a compulsory citation that enacts the performative maintenance of gender. Maree agrees with the current research stance that the meanings of gendered language are not fixed or static. However, she also suggests that we must be aware that "[l]ike performative verbs, elements of language that index gender do not exist in a social vacuum—they are subject to *social regulations*" (Maree 2003 my emphasis). I wish to keep these points in mind in the following section when considering how men's speech has been researched in the Japanese context.

4. Japanese Men's Speech

Sturtz (Sreetharan)[4] is one of the only published researchers to empirically investigate men's speech.[5] She notes that early language and gender research approached women's speech as more marked than men's speech. Men's speech was unproblematically associated with 'canonical' speech and thus never subjected to thorough empirical investigation (Sturtz 2002: 49; Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 81). Sturtz argues that as a result we know very little about the *gendered* speech patterns of men that is not conflated with the stereotype of *otoko kotoba* (Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 82-85). Her research aims to disrupt stereotypes of men's speech by explicitly investigating the speech of so-called 'canonical speakers'; those subjects considered to be the most 'unmarked' and 'normative' examples of Japanese men—students, salarymen and senior citizens (Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 83-85).

Indeed, Sturtz's analysis locates an overall avoidance of the stereotypically masculine register by her male subjects in their casual conversations (Sturtz 2001: 139; Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 89-92, 2004b). Her quantitative analysis found that while the zero-occurrence of SFPs was most frequent (Sturtz 2001: 100; Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 88-89) when SFPs were used, all participants favored the neutral register (Sturtz 2001: 100; Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 88, 92). In contrast, she found that "the overall use of either stereotypically masculine or feminine forms occurs relatively infrequently" (Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a: 89). When these forms do appear, there seems to be differences in their use according to lifestage membership (Sturtz 2001; Sturtz Sreetharan 2004a, 2004b). The students used the largest variety and frequency of masculine forms, and the seniors, followed by the salarymen, used the largest variety and frequency of feminine forms, albeit still within a limited statistical range.

While the qualitative analyses in Sturtz's published works to date predominately focus on the men's use of 'masculine' forms, here I will consider her discussion of their use of 'feminine' forms. Sturtz understands the elder men's use of feminine forms not "as *feminine* indexes *per se* but rather as indexes of

politeness and good manners," related to their membership in 'white-collar' or 'middle-class' society (Sturtz 2001: 121 emphasis in original). She concludes, "[t]he pattern here appears to be that [certain moderately feminine] SFPs are not yet appropriate final forms for the younger speakers but are appropriate for the *sarariiman* and the retired men" (Sturtz 2001: 119).[6] Furthermore, she regards the men's negligible use of 'strongly feminine' SFPs as "unsurprising" precisely because they are *ideologically* 'strongly feminine' (Sturtz 2001: 100).

While Sturtz's discussion about men's use of gendered SFPs in terms of lifestage membership is insightful, I would like to consider her analysis in terms of sexuality and gender, as discussed in the previous section. Sturtz's research seems to suggest that while normative men may not be expected to conform to stereotypes of male speech – the exclusive and frequent use of 'gender-appropriate' speech – they are certainly not expected to engage in 'deviant' gender transgressive speech. This is in contrast to the recent literature on female speakers which locates the divergence of women's speech from the stereotype of *onna kotoba* in their limited use of strongly feminine forms *and* their 'subversive' and creative use of 'gender in-appropriate' forms, i. e. *otoko kotoba* (Matsumoto 1996, 2002; Okamoto 1995). I argue that it is necessary to specifically investigate the potential significance of this appropriate/inappropriate dichotomy regarding men's use of feminine forms that Sturtz has located. Indeed, re-reading Sturtz's results from this perspective, I suggest that we need to understand what makes these forms potentially taboo for young men and in what contexts and frequencies they become appropriate for elder men. This apparent 'taboo' of (at least 'normative') men's linguistic gender transgressions is in need of specific examination.

In their chapter on sexual and gender non-normative speakers' negotiations with gendered language in the Japanese context, Wim Lunsing and Claire Maree (2004:92) ask the question, "What gender and sexuality norms police the borders of Japanese language use?" In the next section I will begin to consider this question in regard to both gay and straight male speakers.[7] To investigate this I will discuss two discourses regarding gender, sexuality and Japanese men, as illustrated by the salaryman and *onē*. The salaryman is widely considered the dominant image of hegemonic masculinity in Japan. *Onē*, which literally means "big sister" and is used to refer to effeminate gay men, is portrayed in the media as *the* image of male homosexuality in Japan, alongside other figures such as the *okama*. Through discussing these two discourses on men in Japanese society, I wish to consider how gender and sexuality are implicated and how this may relate to male speakers' use of gendered language in the Japanese context.

5. Hegemonic Masculinity and Heterosexuality in the Japanese Context

As discussed above, the conflation of gender and sexuality is an important working of heteronormativity. This is also inherent in the concept of 'hegemonic masculinity'. Hegemonic masculinity refers to the dominant, yet generally unachievable, norm of masculinity (Kimmel 1994: 126). It is not a static concept, but is historically and culturally specific (Connell 1995; Kimmel 1994: 120). The repudiation of femininity and homosexuality is widely considered essential to the achievement of 'hegemonic masculinity' in contemporary Western societies (Alsop et al 2002: 142; Kimmel 1994: 126-133). Borrowing from psychoanalysis, Butler (1995: 26; c. f. Kimmel 1994: 126) suggests that the two are intrinsically linked for "[b]ecoming a 'man' [. . .] requires a repudiation of femininity, but also a repudiation that becomes a precondition for the heterosexualization of sexual desire." Under the conflation of gender and sexuality, homosexuality becomes "the repository of whatever is symbolically expelled from hegemonic masculinity" (Connell 1995: 78) and, consequently, homosexuals are widely portrayed as "gender

traitors" (Hopkins 1996: 98).

Masculinity is portrayed as a natural and yet "tenuous and fragile" identity (Kimmel 1994: 127) that needs to be continuously proved and maintained (Hopkins 1996: 107-108; Kimmel 1994: 122). Dasgupta (2000, 2003) has discussed this in regard to the hegemonic model of masculinity in Japan, the salaryman. The salaryman is described as the embodiment of the "archetypal heterosexual husband/father and producer/provider" citizen (Dasgupta 2003: 119). Dasgupta's investigation, however, reveals how salaryman masculinity is not a natural category, but "[is] created and recreated through socioeconomic and cultural institutions and practices" (2003: 119) and requires significant work, or 'crafting', to be successfully maintained (Dasgupta 2000: 193-198, 2003: 123-127).

Success or failure for the salaryman hinges on "his ability to conform to the requirements of the hegemonic discourse—to marry at an age deemed suitable, and once married to perform the appropriate gender role of husband/provider/father" (Dasgupta 2003: 123). Popular culture inscriptions—such as employment manuals, comics and etiquette books—specifically delineate that "to be successful at performing hegemonic masculinity one needs to successfully perform (or present the outward appearance of performing) heterosexuality" (Dasgupta 2003: 127). While this is cast as "desirable" for non-producers—for example students and young adults—it is demanded of the salaryman (Dasgupta 2000: 198, 2003: 126-127).

Unlike 'deviant' gay and lesbian sexualities, heterosexuality "is rarely acknowledged or, even less likely, problematized" (Richardson 1996: 1) and is seldom explicitly presented as an 'identity' (Cameron and Kulick 2003: 44-73; c. f. Richardson 1996: 13). Yet, it is demanded for full participation in Japanese society, or in other words, to be recognized as a full citizen and receive the corresponding privileges. Vera Mackie's (2000b: 246) investigation of the gendered and sexual subtexts of citizenship in Japan demonstrates how "the model of the citizen is based on being part of a nuclear family unit based upon a heterosexual couple." This is the only model of life that is privileged and supported by government social policies (Mackie 2000: 246-7). Lunsing's (2001) research on the relationship between *jōshiki* [commonsense] and the normalization of marriage in Japan reiterates Mackie's claims. He elucidates that "in order to become *ichininmae no shakaijin* (a fully adult social being) one has to marry" (Lunsing 2001: 74) and thus be heterosexual (Lunsing 2001: 315), or at least maintain an appearance of successful heterosexuality (Dasgupta 2003: 127). These examples explicitly demonstrate how 'normative' models of citizenship, which implicate dominant models of masculinity, have a 'sexual subtext' (Mackie 2000b).

Through our discussion of the salaryman, we have seen how heterosexuality is presented as the desirable mode of life in Japan, and how it intersects with normative notions of gender to demand compliance. How this relates to male speakers' use of gendered language in various contexts remains to be explicitly investigated. Research on heterosexuality and gendered language use is only just emerging and there is only one researcher who I have been able to locate who has investigated this in regard to men's speech in the Japanese context. In her analysis of domestic Japanese and translated romance novels, Janet Shibamoto Smith (2004) has found that *onna kotoba* and *otoko kotoba* seem to be used in various ways by the heroines and heroes in these novels to communicate femininity and masculinity, and thus their "heterosexual attractiveness". This is in contrast to Harlequin-style translations[8] which achieve this through vivid, sexually attractive physical descriptions of the characters. This analysis opens up a series of questions regarding how 'masculine' and 'feminine' speech is used as a culturally semiotic device to

communicate heterosexual desire. And, again, it demonstrates the conflation of normative gender with normative sexuality, at least in the context of the hetero-romance novel.[9]

There is definitely much room for further research into the intersections between heterosexuality and gendered language use by male speakers. Conversely, while research into gendered language use and homosexuality is also still in the minority, humanities based research provides significant insight into the intersections of gender, sexuality and language use in the Japanese context.

6. Male Homosexuality in the Japanese Context – The Importance of Nomenclature

Recent investigations into male homosexuality in post-war Japan have emphasized the importance of considering the nomenclature used by gay men, and others outside of the gay community, to refer to various homosexual orientations, in order to fully understand male homosexuality in the Japanese context (Fushimi 1998; Fushimi et al 2002; Lunsing and Maree 2004; McLelland 2005). They suggest that debates regarding nomenclature may also better inform our investigations of how homosexual orientation and language use may play out in the Japanese context.

One example from this literature is the use of the term gay/*gei* in the Japanese context. In his extensive investigation of male homosexuality in post-war Japan, Mark McLelland (2005) reminds us of the problems associated with using "gay" as an all encompassing term to refer to male homosexuals in postwar Japan. *Gei* is said to have entered Japanese terminology during the occupation, when occupation soldiers used the term *gei bōi*[10] to refer to their Japanese male partners (McLelland 2005: 77-80). Although both *gei* in Japanese and "gay" in the American context emerged around the same time during the 1950s, the terms were used in very different respects. In the American context, "gay" was a new coinage that referred to a gay identity removed from associations with pathology and transgenderism, and which was instead associated with "a more masculine, or at times hypermasculine, mode of presentation" (McLelland 2004: 102). Conversely, in Japan *gei* "emerged as a transgender category strongly associated with the entertainment world and was not available as a designation for more gender-normative, masculine homosexual men" (McLelland 2004: 102). Indeed, the term *gei* was not used in reference to Japanese male homosexuals in Japan's first commercial "gay" magazine, *Barazoku*, "because of its strong transgender and commercial associations" (McLelland 2004: 142). Instead the term *homo* was favored and it continued until the 1980s to be the self-referent of choice for masculine identifying male homosexuals.

From the 1950s, *gei* and *gei bōi* were used by the mainstream Japanese media to refer to effeminate homosexual men, and it is this image of male homosexuality that has remained dominant until the present day. Like many modern Western cultures, gender transgression and homosexuality are typically conflated in Japan (Lunsing 2001; McLelland 2000, 2003; Valentine 1997a, 1997b). In his research on Japanese media representations of marginalized sexualities and genders, Valentine (1997b: 58) found that "sexuality [typically] becomes visible through gender boundaries and their transgression." McLelland's examination of representations of gay men in Japanese popular culture reiterates Valentine's findings. He argues that "mainstream media [tend] to highlight gay men's difference in terms of gender" (McLelland 2003: 74).

However, it is important to note that, at the same time, cross-dressing in Japanese culture does not necessarily imply a homosexual identity in the way that the image of effeminate men may in many Western

cultures (McLelland 2000: 44-45). McLelland (2000: 44) writes that when cross-dressing occurs within specific spaces, such as the entertainment world, Japanese people "are reluctant to read [it] as an expression of sexual identity" seeing it instead as "an individual's act or performance." Indeed, images of gender ambivalence in the entertainment world are often admired, particularly by women (McLelland 2000: 43-160), seen as humorous and non-threatening (Valentine 1997b: 64-66), and are even prized (McLelland 2000: 47). However, in the real world, gender non-normativity and gender transgression are more likely to be despised (McLelland 2000: 47).

From the late 1980s, lesbians and gay men in Japan began to organize politically and there was another shift in the nomenclature used by, and about, male homosexuals. The term *homo* was gradually replaced by the previously avoided term *gei*, which now referred to "a more activist-oriented homosexual inclination without any transgender connotations" (McLelland 2005: 155). Nonetheless, the overarching conflation of gender transgression with homosexuality persists in mainstream Japanese society. Fushimi Noriaki (1998), among others (Lunsing 2001, 2003; Lunsing and Maree 2004; McLelland 2000), has documented the difficulties many gay men, in particular young gay men, have with this image of gay men as transgendered. One particular example which often appears in the literature is in regard to the use of gendered language.

6-1 *Onē* and *onē kotoba*

In the beginning of his seminal work, *Private Gay Life*, Fushimi (1998: 21-23) provides a "Gay Question and Answer" section subtitled, "The world you want to know but know nothing about." Fushimi uses these ten questions and answers to problematize various stereotypes of gay men commonly held by straight society. Of particular interest for this paper is question eight which asks, "Do all gay men speak using *onē kotoba*?"

Onē kotoba [effeminate, camp speech] comes from the term *onēsan kotoba,* which literally means big-sister speech (McLelland 2000: 47). *Onē kotoba* is typically glossed as featuring the linguistic forms associated with the feminine, and is widely attributed to the speech of *okama* [another term commonly used to refer to effeminate (gay) men] and the gay community at large. However, Fushimi (1998: 22) reminds the reader that the use of *onē kotoba* is more than a display of 'femininity', in other words the femininity associated with normative heterosexual women. He emphasizes the performative nature of *onē kotoba* and argues that it is a parody of hetero-femininity. Indeed, Lunsing (2004) also offers "crudity" and "sarcasm" —characteristics presumably not associated with normative femininity—as key features of *onē kotoba.*

However, in his reply to this question, Fushimi is quick to denounce the stereotype of all gay men as effeminate, as implicated by the idea that gay men speak like 'women'. He reminds the reader that there are a range of positionalities within the subject position of "gay", from macho types to gender-normative gay men. He writes that because the only image of gay men portrayed in mainstream media is of trangendered gay men, this image is considered to be the norm by straight society. This approach is an important aspect of Fushimi's writing, and represents what has been called a "soft" approach to gay and lesbian, or "queer" identities in the Japanese context (McLelland 2005: 180-184). While he is stringent in problematizing the stereotype of all gay men as effeminate, he does not suggest that there is anything wrong with men being feminine, and in fact suggests that using *onē kotoba* can be liberating for men.

He stresses that the final decision on all such matters remains with the individual in concern, the *tōjisha*.

Nonetheless, Fushimi notes that many gay men who consider their homosexual orientation to be completely unrelated to gender and simply a matter of the object of their (sexual) desire being a fellow man, feel uncomfortable with the *onē* stereotype. While there is still only limited linguistic data on gay men's speech, anecdotal evidence presented in the humanities suggests that gay men negotiate with linguistic norms and sometimes experience extensive linguistic (self-)regulation. Lunsing (2001: 270 citing Fushimi 1991; Lunsing 2003: 32) discusses examples of gay men who cannot bring themselves to use 'masculine' speech, for example the traditionally strongly masculine pronoun *ore*. Many report to have been teased or bullied because of this, particularly during their school years (Hirano 1994 cited in Lunsing 2001: 270). Some gay men have said that they try to camouflage their homosexuality by avoiding the media stereotype of gay men as feminine. This sometimes involves purposely putting on a "masculine act." The famous gay activist Itō Satoru (1998: 84) relays his experiences of this and how he forced himself to use the strongly masculine speech register, including personal pronouns, SFPs and phonological reductions. In contrast, many of McLelland's (2000: 203) gay informants reported feeling "alienated" by the use of *onē kotoba* on the gay scene. However, conversely, some gay men prefer to use *onē kotoba* in order to "distinguish [themselves] from straight men" (Lunsing 2001: 274-275 citing Uchikoshi 1995).

I cite these examples here to demonstrate the strength of social discourses that conflate (linguistic) gender transgression with homosexuality. These examples also demonstrate a range of reactions and coping strategies employed by gay men, generally not accounted for. It seems that Fushimi's (1998: 247) revealing observation that discrimination against effeminate men and discrimination against homosexual men are two different issues, is also relevant when investigating men's use of gendered language. We have seen how the discourse of gay men as gender non-normative permeates Japanese popular culture and society. However, how dominant and local discourses of gender and sexuality articulate with each other, and how this possibly intersects with 'real' men's linguistic practices, is yet to be fully accounted for. This suggests the need for further analysis and discussion in the field of men's speech research.

7. Conclusion

This paper has considered how men's speech has been researched in the larger context of the field of gendered language in Japanese. I argued that approaching future research and analysis into men's speech with a greater consideration of sexuality and gender can give us new insights into men's use and non-use of gendered language. To demonstrate this, this paper discussed two examples of popularized discourses surrounding gender, sexuality and Japanese men. While the pragmatic use and shifting meanings of gendered language, and the gap between ideology and actual usages, must be kept at the center of research, a greater awareness of how cultural and sub-cultural prescriptions police gendered language use is also needed. It is hoped that future analyses of both "real" and "fictional" examples of gendered language use by various male speaking subjects can draw from this discussion.

1 . Hereafter, 'Japanese women's language' and 'Japanese men's language' are referred to as *onna kotoba* and *otoko kotoba*. In general discussions on gendered language, the terms 'women's language' and 'men's language' are used.

2 . Sentence Final Particles.

3 . The concept of 'heteronormativity' is referred to by various terms such as 'heterosexism', 'compulsory heterosexuality', 'heterogender bias', 'heterosexual matrix', etc.

4 . Hereafter referred to in text as, Sturtz.

5 . However, note there have been several cross-sex studies which include an analysis of men's speech patterns (see for example Kobayashi 1993, 1997; Shibamoto Smith 2004; Uchida 1997; also see the 2004 volume "Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology" for further examples.) Other researchers have examined the speech patterns of gay men (Ogawa and (Shibamoto) Smith 1997; Lunsing and Maree 2004). I will discuss Shibamoto Smith's (2004) paper in the following section.

6 . The stereotypically feminine SFPs in question include ADJ/V*no, noyo/none, wane*, NOM*yo* and NOM*ne*.

7 . In this analysis I do not wish to set up an opposition between "gay" and "straight" men and "gay" and "straight" men's speech. I simply want to investigate two dominant *discourses* regarding male gender and sexuality and consider how these may potentially influence ideologies of men's speech and men's actual speech.

8 . English to Japanese translations.

9 . It is interesting to note that the male characters' use of normatively gendered language is not to the extent of the female characters' usage. However, Shibamoto Smith does note that an analysis of other linguistic forms strongly associated with masculine speech were not included in the scope of her analysis, which may have affected her findings (Shibamoto Smith 2004: 127).

10. *Gei bōi* was an occupational category of effeminate-looking men who work at *gei bā*.

参考文献

Alsop, R. et al., eds. 2002. 'Theorizing Men and Masculinities'. In, R. Alsop et al., eds. *Theorizing gender*. UK: Polity Press, 130-164.

Butler, J. 1993. *Bodies That Matter On The Discursive Limits of "Sex"*. New York and London: Routledge.

Butler, J. 1995. 'Melancholy Gender/Refused Identification'. In, M. Berger, B. Wallis and S. Watson, eds. *Constructing Masculinity*. New York and London: Routledge, 21-36.

Cameron, D. and D. Kulick. 2003. *Language and Sexuality*. UK: Cambridge University Press.

Connell, R. 1995. *Masculinities*. St. Leonards, Victoria: Allen & Unwin.

Dasgupta, R. 2000. 'Performing Masculinities? The "Salaryman" at Work and Play'. *Japanese Studies*. 20(2): 189-200.

Dasgupta, R. 2003. 'Creating Corporate Warriors: The "salaryman" and masculinity in Japan'. In, K. Louie and M. Low, eds. *Asian Masculinities: the meaning and practice of manhood in China and Japan*. London and New York: Routledge, 118-134.

Eckert, P. and S. McConnell-Ginet. 1992. 'Think Practically and Look Locally: Language and Gender as Community-Based Practice'. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 21: 461-490.

Fushimi N. 1998. *Puraibēto Gei Raifu* [Private Gay Life]. Tokyo: Gakuyō Bunko.

Fushimi, N., et al., eds. 2002. *Okama wa sabetsu ka: Shūkan kinyōbi no sabetsu hyōgen jiken* [Does *okama* have discriminatory connotations? The discriminating expression case in *shūkan kinyōbi*]. Tokyo: Potto shuppan.

Hirano, H. 1994. *Anchi Heterosekushizumu* [Anti-heterosexism]. Tokyo: Pandora/Gendai Shokan.

Hopkins, P. D. 1996. Gender Treachery: Homophobia, Masculinity, and Threatened Identities. In, L. May, R. Strikwerda and P. D. Hopkins, eds. *Rethinking Masculinity: Philosophical Explorations in Light of Feminism*. USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 95-115.

Itō, Satoru. 1998. 'Hopes and Dreams'. In B. Summerhawk et al., eds. *Queer Japan: Personal Stories of Japanese Lesbians, Gays, Bisexuals and Transsexuals*. Norwich: New Victoria Publishers, Inc., 77-96.

Johnson, S. and U. H. Meinhof, eds. 1997. *Language and Masculinity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Kimmel, M. S. 1994. 'Masculinity as Homophobia: Fear, Shame, and Silence in the Construction of Gender Identity'. In, H. Brod and M. Kaufman, eds. *Theorising Masculinities*. California: Sage Publications Inc., 119-141.

Kobayashi, M. 1993. 'Sedai to Joseigo: Wakai sedai no kotoba no "chūseika" ni tsuite' [Generation and Language: Neutralization in youth speech]. *Nihongogaku.* 12(6): 181-192.

Kobayashi, M. 1997. 'Jisho, taisho wa chūseika suruka?' [Will first and second person pronouns neutralize?]. In, Gendai Nihongo Kenkyūkai, eds. *Josei no kotoba: Shokubahen* [Women's language in the Workplace]. Tokyo: Hitsuji Shobyo, 113-137.

Lunsing, W. 2001. *Beyond Common Sense: Sexuality and Gender in Contemporary Japan.* London: Kegan Paul Limited.

Lunsing, W. 2003. 'What masculinity? Transgender practices among Japanese "men"'. In, J. E. Roberson and N. Suzuki, eds. *Men and Masculinities in Contemporary Japan: Dislocating the Salaryman Doxa.* London, New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 20-36.

Lunsing, W and C. Maree. 2004. 'Shifting Speakers: Negotiating Reference in Relation to Sexuality and Gender'. In, S. Okamoto and J. S. Shibamoto Smith, eds. *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 92-109.

Maree, C. 2000. 'Kotoba no wana no negoshieshon' [Negotiating the Trap of Language]. *Gendai Shisō.* 18(14): 212-224.

Maree, C. 2003. '"Ore wa ore dakara" (Because I'm me): a study a gender and language in the documentary "Shinjuku Boys"'. *Intersections* (9): http://wwwsshe.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/issue9/maree.html. Accessed 14 June, 2003.

Matsumoto, Y. 1996. 'Does less feminine speech in Japanese mean less femininity?' In, N. Warner et al., eds. *Gender and Belief Systems: Proceedings of the Fourth Berkeley Women and Language Conference.* Berkeley: Berkeley Women and Language Group, 455-468.

Matsumoto, Y. 2002. 'Gender identity and the presentation of self in Japanese'. In, S. Benor et al., eds. *Gendered practices in language.* Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, 339-354.

McLelland, M. 2000. *Male Homosexuality in Modern Japan: Cultural Myths and Social Realities.* UK: Curzon.

McLelland, M. 2003. 'Gay Men, masculinity and the Media in Japan'. In, K. Louie and M. Low, eds. *Asian Masculinities: the meaning and practice of manhood in China and Japan.* New York and London: Routledge, 59-78.

McLelland, M. 2005. *Queer Japan from the Pacific War to the Internet Age.* USA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Ochs, E. 1992. 'Indexing Gender'. In, A. Duranti and C. Goodwin, eds. *Rethinking context Language as an interactive phenomenon.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 335-358.

Ogawa, N. and J. (Shibamoto) Smith 1997. 'The Gendering of the Gay Male Sex Class in Japan: A Case Study Based on *Rasen No Sobyō*'. In, A. Livia and K. Hall, eds. *Queerly Phrased: language, gender, and sexuality.* New York: Oxford University Press, 402-415.

Okamoto, S. 1995. '"Tasteless" Japanese: Less "Feminine" Speech among Young Japanese Women'. In, K. Hall and M. Bucholtz. *Gender Articulated: Language and the Socially Constructed Self.* New York: Routledge.

Okamoto, S. and J. S. Shibamoto Smith, eds. 2004. *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Richardson, D. 1996. 'Heterosexuality and social theory'. In, D. Richardson, ed. *Theorising Heterosexuality: Telling it straight.* Buckingham, Philadelphia: Open University Press, 1-20.

Rose, M. and D. Sharma. 2002. 'Introduction: Ideology and Identity in Practice'. In, S. Benor et al., eds. *Gendered Practices in Language.* Stanford, California: CSLI Publications, 1-20.

Shibamoto Smith, J. S. 2004. 'Language and Gender in the (Hetero) Romance: "Reading" the Ideal Hero/ine through Lovers' Dialogue in Japanese Romance Fiction'. In, S. Okamoto and J. S. Shibamoto Smith, eds. *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 113-130.

Sturtz, C. 2001. *Danseigo da zo! Japanese Men's Language: Stereotypes, Realities, and Ideologies.* [unpublished dissertation]. Davis: University of California.

Sturtz, C. 2002. 'Uwaki tte iu no wa attemo ii n janai ka?: Japanese Men's Conversations Up-Close and Personal'. *Japanese Studies* 22(1): 49-63.

Sturtz Sreetharan, C. 2004a. 'Students, *sarariiman* (pl.), and seniors: Japanese men's use of "manly" speech register'.

Language in Society 33: 81-107.

Sturtz Sreetharan, C. 2004b. 'Japanese Men's Linguistic Stereotypes and Realities: Conversations from the Kansai and Kanto Regions'. In, S. Okamoto and J. S. Shibamoto Smith, eds. *Japanese Language, Gender, and Ideology: Cultural Models and Real People.* New York: Oxford University Press, 275-289.

Uchida, N. 1997. 'Kaiwa kōdō ni mirareru seisa [Sex differences in conversations]. In, S. Ide, ed. *Joseigo no sekai.* Tokyo: Meiji Shoin, 74-93.

Valentine, J. 1997a. 'Pots and Pans: Identification of Queer Japanese in Terms of Discrimination'. In, A. Livia and K. Hall. *Queerly Phrased: language, gender, and sexuality.* New York: Oxford University Press, 95-114.

Valentine, J. 1997b. 'Skirting and Suiting Stereotypes Representations of Marginalised Sexualities in Japan'. *Theory, Culture & Society.* 14(3): 57-85.