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This paper presents an overview of the three-tier model of language use as a theory that can provide an explanatory basis for grammatico-pragmatic phenomena in Japanese and English. Based on Hirose’s (1995, 2000, etc.) concepts of public and private self as two aspects of the speaker, the model states that language use consists of three tiers called situation construal, situation report, and interpersonal relationship, and that languages differ as to how the three tiers are combined, according to whether their basic egocentricity lies in the public self, as in English, or the private self, as in Japanese. Not only does the paper provide arguments for this theory, but it also shows that grammatico-pragmatic differences between Japanese and English stem from the difference in the way the three tiers are linked in each language.*
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1. Introduction: Three Perspectives on the Relation between Grammar and Pragmatics

This paper presents an overview of the three-tier model of language use as a theory that can provide an explanatory basis for grammatico-pragmatic phenomena in Japanese and English. The model is built on the concepts of public and private self as two aspects of the speaker, which have been developed in a series of previous studies (Hirose (1995, 1997, 2000, 2002), Hasegawa and Hirose (2005), Hirose and Hasegawa (2010)). Briefly, the three-tier model hypothesizes that language use consists of three tiers called
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situation construal, situation report, and interpersonal relationship, and that languages differ as to how the three tiers are combined, according to whether their basic egocentricity lies in the public self, as in English, or the private self, as in Japanese.

A look at recent contrastive studies of Japanese and English suggests that there are three useful perspectives from which to compare grammatico-pragmatic phenomena in the two languages: they are the perspectives of “cognitive linguistics,” “sociolinguistics,” and “public and private self.”

The cognitive-linguistic perspective draws attention to the distinction between subjective and objective construal in the sense of Langacker (e.g. 1991), and it has often been argued from this perspective that while English prefers objective construal, Japanese prefers subjective construal (Mori (1998), Uehara (1998), Ikekami (2000), Honda (2005), etc.). Thus, as observed by Nishimura (2000), the first-person subject of a perception construction is usually expressed overtly in English, but not in Japanese.\footnote{The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of examples in this paper: Acc = accusative, Cop = copula, Dat = dative, Hon = honorific, HS = hearsay, Loc = locative, NMLZ = nominalizer, Nom = nominative, Pol = polite, Pres = present, Q = question, Quot = quotative, SFP = sentence-final particle, Stat = stative, Super-Pol = super-polite, Top = topic.}

(1) I see a bus over there.

(2) Mukoo-ni basu-ga mie-ru.
   over.there-Loc bus-Nom see-Pres
   ‘(I) see a bus over there.’

In Langackerian terms, the overt use of I in (1) means that the speaker as the subject of perception is placed “onstage” with the other participants, thus objectively construed as an object of description. On the other hand, the non-representation of the speaker in (2) indicates that the speaker as the subject of perception is placed “offstage” and relegated to the background of consciousness; it is thereby implied that the speaker of (2) is subjectively involved, or immersed, in the situation he is describing. Then, the question to ask is where the difference in preference of construal comes from.

Contrastive studies from the sociolinguistic perspective emphasize that in communication Japanese speakers must always consider and encode their relationship with the addressee, while English speakers need not—a fact that has been used as evidence against the universal validity of Brown and Levinson’s (1987) approach to politeness based on an individual’s face (Matsumoto (1988), Ide (2006), etc.). For example, as noted by Matsumoto
(1988), when telling someone in conversation that today is, say, Saturday, Japanese speakers rarely use a plain-form sentence like (3), which would sound as if they were talking to themselves or to someone very close to them; instead, they normally say sentences such as those in (4), employing a sentence-final particle like yo, or the polite or super-polite form of the copula (i.e. desu or degozaimasu) in accordance with their social or socio-psychological relationship with the addressee.

(3) Kyoo-wa doyoobi da.
   ‘Today is Saturday.’

(4) Kyoo-wa doyoobi {da yo / desu / degozaimasu}.
   ‘Today is Saturday.’

English speakers, on the other hand, can utilize the same sentence Today is Saturday to talk to anyone, regardless of their mutual relationship.

It should be noticed that subjectivity in cognitive linguistics involves the relation between situations and speakers as individual beings, while in sociolinguistics much attention is paid to the interpersonal relation between speakers and addressees. We need to take both perspectives into account to fully investigate the relation between grammar and pragmatics.

Particularly effective in this respect is the perspective of public and private self. In a series of studies, Hirose has shown that the distinction between public and private self as two aspects of the speaker plays a significant role in contrastive studies of Japanese and English concerning issues related to egocentricity in language such as deixis (Hirose (1995, 1997, 2000, 2002), Hasegawa and Hirose (2005), Hirose and Hasegawa (2010)). The public self is the speaker as the subject of communicating, i.e. the speaker who faces an addressee or has one in mind, while the private self is the speaker as the subject of thinking or consciousness, i.e. the speaker who has no addressee in mind. Egocentricity seems to be a universal linguistic property, but languages exhibit different characteristics, depending on whether their unmarked deictic center is in the public self or the private self. Incorporating this perspective enables us to construct a theory that integrates the perspectives of cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics, and that is the three-tier model of language use, which makes it possible to give a more unified and principled account of grammatico-pragmatic differences between Japanese and English, as we will see in what follows.
2. The Three-Tier Model of Language Use

The three-tier model can be summarized in the following four main points.

(5) The speaker, who construes a situation and encodes it linguistically, can be deconstructed into the public self as the subject of communicating and the private self as the subject of thinking or consciousness. English is a public-self-centered language, whereas Japanese is a private-self-centered language.

(6) Language use consists of three tiers: one is the situation construal tier, in which the speaker as private self construes a situation, forming a thought about it; another is the situation report tier, in which the speaker as public self reports or communicates his construed situation to the addressee; and the third is the interpersonal relationship tier, in which the speaker as public self construes and considers his interpersonal relationship with the addressee. Languages differ as to how the three tiers are combined, according to whether their basic egocentricity lies in the public self or the private self.

(7) In English, a public-self-centered language, the situation construal tier is normally unified with the situation report tier, to which is added the interpersonal relationship tier; see Figure 1 below.\(^2\) The unification of situation construal and situation report means that one gives priority to the outside perspective from which to report a situation and linguistically encodes as much as is necessary to do so. Thus, even when the speaker himself is involved in a situation as a participant, the reporter’s perspective places his self as a participant on a par with the other partici-

\(^2\) In Figures 1 and 2, S stands for “speaker or self,” O for “situation as object of construal,” and H for “hearer or addressee”; the single arrow (→) denotes the process of “construing,” and the double arrow (⇒) that of “reporting or communicating (to someone)”; and the circle (○) indicates where the unmarked deictic center is located. The relation symbolized by “S → H” should be read as the speaker construing his interpersonal relationship with the addressee. In Figure 1, the vertical arrow from the S of the situation report tier to the S of the situation construal tier is meant to indicate that the private self construing the situation is encoded from the perspective of the speaker as public self (cf. section 3). In Figure 2, the vertical arrow from the S of the situation report tier to the S of the interpersonal relationship tier is meant to indicate that in reporting a situation to the addressee, the speaker as public self encodes (in one way or another) his construal of his interpersonal relationship with the addressee (cf. section 5).
pants; hence comes objective construal. On the other hand, the fact that the situation report tier is not unified with the interpersonal relationship tier means that one can assume an unmarked (or neutral) level of communication which does not depend on any particular relationship between speaker and addressee, a level where the speaker and the addressee are assumed to be linguistically equal, being in a symmetrical relationship. This default level of communication can be modified, though, by taking into account additional factors concerning the interpersonal relationship between speaker and addressee, such as politeness, deference, and intimacy.

![Figure 1](image.png)

**Figure 1.** English as a public-self-centered language

(8) In Japanese, a private-self-centered language, the situation construal tier is normally independent of the situation report tier and the interpersonal relationship tier; see Figure 2 below. Thus, in construing a situation, the speaker can freely place himself in the situation and view it from the inside; also, he does not need to linguistically encode what is already given in his consciousness; hence comes subjective construal.³ On the other hand, the situation report tier is unified with the interpersonal relationship tier, which means that in reporting a situation to someone, the speaker must always construe and consider his relationship with

³ That is, subjective construal is when the speaker places himself in a situation and sees it from the inside, in which case the self construing the situation is relegated to the background of consciousness and hence not represented linguistically. It is for this reason that the first-person subject is unexpressed in the Japanese example (2) as opposed to the English example (1). For more detailed discussion, see Hirose (2013).
the addressee, defining himself and the addressee in terms of that relationship. Thus, in situation report, interpersonal relationship is linguistically encoded as much as possible, and there is no unmarked level of communication neutral to interpersonal relationship.4

Figure 2. Japanese as a private-self-centered language

In what follows, I will provide arguments for the three-tier model and illustrate how it accounts for grammatico-pragmatic differences between Japanese and English.

3. English as a Public-Self-Centered Language and Japanese as a Private-Self-Centered Language

One of the important hypotheses of the three-tier model is that English is a public-self-centered language, whereas Japanese is a private-self-centered language. Let me briefly explain this hypothesis. As I mentioned earlier, the public self is the speaker as the subject of communicating, i.e. the speaker who faces an addressee or has one in mind, while the private self is

4 It should be noted at this point that the three-tier model incorporates what is known in Japanese linguistics as the distinction between *taizi-teki*, or “situation-oriented,” modality and *taizin-teki*, or “interpersonal,” modality: the former expresses the speaker’s attitude toward a proposition and the latter the speaker’s attitude toward the addressee (e.g. Iori (2001) and references cited there; see also Konno (this issue)). In terms of the three-tier model, *taizi-teki* modality is concerned with situation construal, whereas *taizin-teki* modality is concerned with both situation report and interpersonal relationship. What is important for the three-tier model, however, is not only the *taizi-teki/taizin-teki* distinction itself, but also its integration with the distinction between private and public self, as depicted in Figure 2.
the speaker as the subject of thinking or consciousness, i.e. the speaker who has no addressee in mind. The public and private self are the subjects of two different levels of linguistic expression called public and private expression. Public expression corresponds to the communicative function of language, and private expression to the non-communicative, thought-expressing function of language. Thus public expression requires the presence of an addressee, whereas private expression does not.\(^5\)

With regard to the public and private self, it has been pointed out that Japanese and English differ significantly in how they encode them (see, among others, Hirose (2000)).

(9) Japanese has a special word for private self, zibun ‘self,’ but not any special word for public self, so that in Japanese a variety of words are used to represent the public self, depending on who is talking to whom (e.g. boku ‘I (male-casual),’ watasi ‘I (male-formal, female-formal/informal),’ kinship terms like otoosan/okaasan ‘father/mother,’ and the occupational title sensei ‘teacher’).

(10) English has a special word for public self, I, but not any special word for private self, so that in English, personal pronouns are employed to represent the private self, depending on its grammatical person (e.g. I, you, or he).

In particular, differences in the encoding of the private self in Japanese and English can be seen in the grammar of indirect discourse. As shown in previous studies (Hirose (1995, 1997), Wada (2001, 2008), etc.), while direct discourse is a quotation of public expression, indirect discourse is a quotation of private expression.

Given this, since Japanese has zibun ‘self’ as a special word for private self, one’s inner consciousness about oneself can be described by using zibun, as in (11).

(11) Zibun-wa zettaini tadasi-i.
    self-Top absolutely right-Pres
    Lit. ‘Self be absolutely right.’

This sentence is a self-contained expression in which zibun refers to the subject of the represented consciousness and the present tense of the predicate corresponds to the time of the represented consciousness. Thus (11)

\(^5\) For the importance of private expression as distinguished from public expression, see Konno (this issue), where it is demonstrated that the notion of private expression is essential in describing certain grammatical constructions in Japanese and English.
can be used about any person, irrespective of whether that person is “I,” “you,” or “he.”

(12) Zibun-wa zettaini tadasi-i to {boku / kimi / kare}-wa
  self-Top absolutely right-Pres Quot {I / you / he}-Top
  omotta.
  thought
  Lit. ‘Self be absolutely right, {I / you / he} thought.’

In English, on the other hand, the literal counterparts of (11) and (12), as shown above, are ungrammatical. In order to represent the consciousness of a private self, it is necessary to postulate outside the consciousness a public self, or a reporting speaker, whose perspective determines the grammatical person of the private self and the tense of the represented consciousness, as in (13) (where (b) is a free indirect discourse version of (a)).

(13) a. {I / You / He} thought that {I was / you were / he was} ab-
  solutely right.
  b. {I was / You were / He was} absolutely right ({I / you / he} thought).

In (13), the private self is encoded differently as either I or you or he, depending on its grammatical person, as seen from the public self. Although the represented consciousness semantically corresponds to the present time of the private self, it is formally framed in the past tense, because the present of the private self in the past is regarded as past from the perspective of the public self, whose “now” is the time of reporting.

From these observations, we can say that in Japanese the consciousness of a private self can be expressed in a self-contained way within the consciousness because Japanese is a private-self-centered language, whereas in English it cannot be expressed without postulating a public self outside the consciousness because English is a public-self-centered language. That is, in Japanese, situation construal by a private self can be expressed independently of a public self, while in English it is dependent on situation report by a public self. This provides one piece of evidence that situation construal and situation report in the three-tier model are independent in Japanese, but unified in English.

4. The Unmarked Mode of Expression in Japanese and English

Another important thesis deriving from the three-tier model is that the unmarked mode of expression is private expression in Japanese and public
expression in English. As is well known, according to the Performative Analysis, proposed by Ross (1970), every declarative sentence of English has in its underlying structure a higher performative clause of the form I SAY TO YOU or I TELL YOU, which guarantees that the speaker is talking to the addressee. Thus, for example, sentence (14a) has a structure like (14b).

(14) a. Today is Saturday.
    b. I SAY TO YOU Today is Saturday.

In terms of the three-tier model, the performative part of (14b), I SAY TO YOU, corresponds to situation report, while the propositional part, “Today is Saturday,” corresponds to situation construal. If the relation given in (14b) is incorporated in the simple sentence (14a), then it means that (14a) is a public expression in which situation construal and situation report are unified. In the case of Japanese sentences like (15a), by contrast, it is not possible to assume a similar performative clause, as in (15b).

(15) a. Kyoo-wa doyoobi da.
    Today-Top Saturday Cop
    ‘Today is Saturday.’
    b. #I SAY TO YOU Kyoo-wa doyoobi da.

Evidence for this difference between English and Japanese is provided by Shizawa’s (2009, 2011) contrastive analysis of speech act conditionals such as those in (16) and (17).

(16) a. If you don’t know, I tell you today is Saturday.
    b. If you don’t know, today is Saturday.

(17) a. Sira-nai nara {yuu / osieru} ga, kyoo-wa doyoobi da.
    know-not if {say / tell} but today-Top Saturday Cop
    ‘If (you) don’t know, (I) tell (you) today is Saturday.’
    b. *Sira-nai nara, kyoo-wa doyoobi da.
    know-not if today-Top Saturday Cop
    ‘If (you) don’t know, today is Saturday.’

In (16a), the if-clause modifies the performative clause I tell you, providing a condition on the speaker’s speech act. Furthermore, as (16b) shows, the same if-clause occurs even without an explicit performative clause. This

---

6 By the term unmarked mode of expression is meant the mode of expression (public vs. private) that is normally assumed to be conveyed by simple declarative sentences like Today is Saturday and its Japanese plain-form counterpart, to be discussed below.

7 In fact, as pointed out by Shizawa (2011) and Ikarashi (2013, 2014), it is generally more usual for performative clauses like I tell you not to be explicitly expressed; thus,
means that in English, the utterance *Today is Saturday* itself can be interpreted as a public expression used by the speaker with the intention to communicate with the addressee, which is true regardless of whether or not the Performative Analysis is adopted.

On the other hand, the Japanese counterpart of (16a) is (17a), where the conditional clause, *sira-nai nara* ‘if you don’t know,’ modifies the speech act verb *yuu* ‘say’ or *osieru* ‘tell,’ which linguistically guarantees the speaker’s communicative intention. But, as pointed out by Shizawa, if these verbs are deleted, we get an ungrammatical sentence, as in (17b). That is, in Japanese the simple utterance *Kyoo wa doyoobi da* ‘Today is Saturday’ is itself a private expression in which no communicative intention is assumed; this is why, as observed in section 1, Japanese speakers rarely use sentence (3) in conversation. Note also the acceptability of the following examples.

(18) a. (?)Sira-nai nara, kyoo-wa doyoobi da yo.
   know-not if today-Top Saturday Cop SFP
   ‘If (you) don’t know, today is Saturday.’

   b. *Gozonzi-nai yoo desi tara, kyoo-wa doyoobi*
   know.Hon-not seem Cop.Pol if today-Top Saturday
   desu yo.
   Cop.Pol SFP
   ‘If (you) don’t know, today is Saturday.’

These are (more) acceptable because of the italicized addressee-oriented expressions, which make them public expressions. That is, *yo* in (18a, b) is a sentence-final particle that signals that the speaker is giving the addressee new information that should be kept in mind; *gozonzi, desi,* and *desu* in (18b) are all honorific verbs showing respect for the addressee.

(16b) is more natural than (16a) in conversation. See Ikarashi (2013, 2014) for a discussion of why this is so.

8 In Japanese, *siranai nara {yuu / osieru} ga* in (17a) forms a syntactic unit that functions as a “modality expression,” especially in the sense of Nakau (1994). In terms of the semantic distinction between modality and proposition, the English sentence in (16a) also can be divided as in (i), despite its syntactic structure (ii).

(i) Semantics: [MODALITY If you don’t know, I tell you] [PROPOSITION today is Saturday].

(ii) Syntax: [s1 If you don’t know [s2 I tell you [s3 today is Saturday]]].

The absence of this kind of form-meaning mismatch in (17a) means that Japanese syntax is more faithful than English syntax to the distinction between modality and proposition.
5. Situation Report and Interpersonal Relationship

Let us proceed to consider the relation between situation report and interpersonal relationship in the three-tier model. As we have just seen, the unmarked mode of expression in Japanese is private expression, i.e. not communication but rather representation of thoughts. In order to communicate one’s thoughts to another person, therefore, one has to use appropriate public expressions, paying attention to one’s interpersonal relationship with that person. This means, in terms of the three-tier model, that situation report is unified with interpersonal relationship in Japanese; simply put, it is not possible to communicate in Japanese without regard to interpersonal relationship (Matsumoto (1988), Ide (2006)). Thus, as we saw above, when conveying the message “Today is Saturday” in conversation, Japanese speakers choose among options such as those in (4), depending on their social and psychological relationship with the addressee.

On the other hand, the fact that the English sentence *Today is Saturday* can be used to talk to anyone means that English has an unmarked level of communication independent of particular relationships between speaker and addressee. In terms of the three-tier model, English is different from Japanese in that while situation construal is unified with situation report, situation report is independent of interpersonal relationship. It should be noticed, though, that interpersonal relationship can be reflected in English in the use of various address terms, as exemplified in (19), but they are optional elements and not indispensable for communication.

(19) Today is Saturday, {madam / ma’am / Mrs. Brown / Jane / darling / honey / etc.}.

Conversely, we might say that English has developed a variety of these address terms as a means to additionally express interpersonal relationships independent of situation report. Thus, for example, a highly formal term like madam or ma’am would correspond to the super-polite form degozaimasu in (4), and a term of endearment like darling or honey would correspond to an intimate particle like yo (see Ikarashi (2014) for a discussion of the function of yo in this regard). The important point, however, is that it is optional to use an address term in English, but mandatory to use an appropriate sentence-final expression in Japanese. This difference obviously stems from whether the situation report tier is separable from the interpersonal relation-
ship tier.9

6. Public/Private-Self-Centeredness and Psychological Sentences

So far we have seen the basic structure of the three-tier model. As a further illustration, I will argue that this model can give a principled account of a well-known difference between Japanese and English psychological sentences, i.e. the presence or absence of “person restrictions” on psychological predicates.

Note first that the difference between public-self-centeredness and private-self-centeredness is also reflected in the way (grammatical) person is conceived. In English, a public-self-centered language, there is a fundamental distinction between the first and second persons, on the one hand, and the third person, on the other; as pointed out by Benveniste (1971), the former (I and you) designate the “persons” who constitute the direct participants in a speech act, while the third person is a “non-person” in the sense that it is not a participant in a speech act but a thing that can only be talked about. This person system is grammatically encoded in sentences describing situations because situation construal in English is unified with situation report and takes the perspective of the public self. On the other hand, since Japanese is a private-self-centered language in which situation construal is independent of situation report, the person distinction relevant to the language is between the self (zibun) and others (hito).10 This distinction, which is maintained in situation report as well,11 meshes well with the (supposedly universal) cognitive constraint that one can have direct access to

9 Based on the work of Matsumoto (1989), Lakoff (1990: 174) also makes the following remarks, which are pertinent here: “For Westerners, there is a sharp discrepancy between those aspects of communication that are informative—that is, are in keeping with [Grice’s (1975)] Maxims of the Cooperative Principle and exist for the sake of transmitting factual data about reality—and those that are interactive, designed to create or express the feelings of the participants about their relationship. For the Japanese, there is no such distinction. The interactive relation is encoded and understood as an integral part of the information content of the message.”

10 The Japanese word hito originally means “persons in general,” but is also used for “persons other than the self”; this semantic extension comes from the system of persons in which hito in the sense of “person” is divided into zibun ‘self’ and hito “other than the self” (see Hirose and Hasegawa (2010: 48–55) for detailed discussion).

11 This is clear from the fact that, as illustrated in (i), the noun hito (in the sense of “other person”) is applicable only to the second and third persons, and not to the first person.
one’s own mental states, but not to another’s (cf. Bar-On and Long (2001)).

Thus, in Japanese, when psychological predicates appear in direct, unmodified form, they are interpreted only as expressing the self’s mental state; they cannot express another’s mental state. Hence the well-known contrast between sentences like the following.

(20) a. Watasi-wa sabisi-i.
   I-Top lonely-Pres
   ‘I am lonely.’

b. *Kare-wa sabisi-i.
   he-Top lonely-Pres
   ‘He is lonely.’

In order for a psychological sentence to be interpreted as a report of someone’s mental state, the sentence must imply the presence of a reporter or observer who is doing the reporting. In Japanese, such a function is performed by expressions such as those italicized in (21). In (21a), -gateiru is an evidential expression meaning “be showing signs of”; in (21b), rasii is a hearsay expression meaning “I hear”; and in (21c), tte is a quotative marker indicating what someone has said.

(21) a. Kare-wa sabisi-gatteiru.
   he-Top lonely-be.showing.signs
   Lit. ‘He is showing signs of being lonely.’

b. Kare-wa sabisii rasii.
   he-Top lonely HS
   ‘I hear he is lonely.’

c. Kare-wa sabisii tte.
   he-Top lonely Quot
   ‘He is lonely, he says’

Only when expressions like these are added can Japanese report someone’s mental state.

In English, by contrast, since the situation construal and situation report tiers are unified, both expression of one’s mental state and description of

(i) a. {Anata / Kare}-wa syoozikina hito desu.
   {you / he}-Top honest person Cop.Pol
   ‘{You are / He is} an honest person.’

b. *Watasi-wa syoozikina hito desu.
   I-Top honest person Cop.Pol
   ‘I am an honest person.’
another’s mental state take the form of a report by the public self. That
is, as we have seen from the examples in (13), person and tense marking
in every (finite) sentence in English are attributed to the public self, which
guarantees the presence of a reporter; consequently, psychological sentences
in English can be interpreted as reports of mental states, irrespective of the
person of their subjects. When in the first person present tense, though,
they also serve to express the speaker’s mental states. Thus in (22a), the
private self feeling lonely and the public self reporting it are identical, the
“I” at the time of utterance (pub and priv with the same subscript means
that they are ascribed to the same self).12 In (22b), on the other hand, the
private self feeling lonely is someone other than the speaker, and the speak-
er as public self is reporting that person’s mental state in the “third person
present tense.”

(22) a. \[ \text{pub}_i < \text{priv}_i \left[ \left. \text{pub}_i \ I \text{am} \right\{ \text{lonely} \} \right] \]. (\text{pub}_i = \text{priv}_i)
b. \[ \text{pub}_i < \text{priv}_j \left[ \left. \text{pub}_i \ He \text{is} \right\{ \text{lonely} \} \right] \]. (\text{pub}_i \neq \text{priv}_j)

Notice that although (22b) is a report of another person’s mental state,
it does not take a reporting clause like he thinks. This is because, in the
case of (22b), the speaker is accepting the person’s mental state as valid
and reporting it in so-called free indirect discourse, which lacks a reporting
clause. Thus, in a context such as (23), no reporting clause like he thinks

12 Here I am using the notation, adopted by Hirose (2000) and Hasegawa and Hirose
(2005), in which angle brackets labeled priv represent private expression and square
brackets labeled pub represent public expression. For example, in the following Japanese
indirect-discourse sentence, the reported clause is a private expression attributed to the
matrix subject Ken, construed here as the private self, whereas the whole sentence is a
public expression associated with the speaker as the public self:

(i) \[ \text{pub}_i \ Ken-\text{Top} \ < \text{priv}_j \ zibun-\text{Top} \ okubyoo \ da> \ to \ omotte-\text{iru} \].
Ken-Top self-Top coward Cop Quot think-Stat
‘Ken thinks he is a coward.’
Subscripts such as \( i \) and \( j \) are used to indicate to whom a private or public expression is
attributed. In (i) the public and private expressions are given different subscripts because
they are associated with different individuals. But in a first-person present-tense utter-
ance like (ii), the public and private expressions are ascribed to the same individual, i.e.
the speaker at the time of utterance, and are therefore given the same subscript \( i \).

(ii) \[ \text{pub}_i \ Boku-\text{Top} \ < \text{priv}_i \ zibun-\text{Top} \ okubyoo \ da> \ to \ omou \].
I-Top self-Top coward Cop Quot think.Pres
‘I think I am a coward.’
The same applies to the English example (22a), which, though, does not have an explicit
reporting clause. Note also that in the case of English, the subject-verb part in (22) is
bracketed and labeled pub in the sense that, as mentioned above, person and tense mark-
ing are attributed to the public self.
is utilized because the very fact that the person concerned is crying is construed to provide a reason for the speaker to accept the person’s loneliness as valid.

(23) He is crying, so he is lonely.

The same explanation also applies to second-person cases such as the following.

(24) You are crying, so you are {lonely/sad}.

It is worth mentioning in this connection that in a Japanese sentence like (25) below, which reports another person’s desire, the reporting clause omotte-iru ‘(he) thinks’ cannot be omitted; if it were, the sentence could not be interpreted as reporting the person’s desire. The predicate -tai ‘want’ can only express one’s own desire and as such cannot imply the presence of a reporter.

(25) [pub, Karej-wa <privj kyoosi-ni nari-tai> to omotte-iru].

‘He thinks he wants to be a teacher.’

The literal English counterpart of (25) is (26a), whose free indirect discourse version is (26b).

(26) a. He thinks he wants to be a teacher.

b. He wants to be a teacher.

Here again, as Kevin Moore (personal communication) has pointed out to me, (26b) is used if the speaker accepts the person’s desire as real and valid; otherwise, (26a) is used, i.e., it implicates that the speaker is uncertain about the reality of the person’s desire. This difference is reflected in the fact that while it is possible to read a sentence like (27a) as noncontradictory, (27b) is normally read as contradictory.

(27) a. He thinks he wants to be a teacher, but I’m not sure he really wants to.

b. ??He wants to be a teacher, but I’m not sure he really wants to.

In Japanese, on the other hand, sentence (25) is employed whether the speaker accepts the person’s desire as real or not, because the reporting clause is needed above all to guarantee the presence of a reporter who is doing the reporting. In short, English is different from Japanese in that

---

13 Note, however, that the Japanese counterpart of (27a), given in (i), seems to sound contradictory. If so, we might say that, pragmatically, (25) behaves more like (26b) than (26a) in English.
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not only (26a) but also (26b) is interpreted as a report of another person's mental state, a fact which further supports the argument that the situation construal and situation report tiers are unified in English.

7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have offered an overview of the three-tier model of language use as a theory that can provide an explanatory basis for grammatico-pragmatic phenomena in Japanese and English. There are other important issues to discuss in relation to this theory, for which the interested reader is referred especially to Hirose (2013).

The main characteristic of the three-tier model is that it provides an integrated framework to capture and analyze the relation between grammar and pragmatics by positing multiple tiers that correspond to multiple functions of language. Of the three tiers, the situation construal tier corresponds to the function of expressing thoughts (including emotions), the situation report tier to the function of communicating information to others, and the interpersonal relationship tier to the function of considering and managing interpersonal and interactive relationships. Furthermore, the model is highly original in that it explains grammatico-pragmatic differences between Japanese and English primarily in terms of the way the three tiers are linked in each language.

In conclusion, I hope to have shown, if only briefly, that the three-tier model of language use sheds significant new light on contrastive studies of Japanese and English in particular and cross-linguistic studies of the relation between grammar and pragmatics in general. It is certainly desirable and necessary to investigate how the model can be applied to languages other than Japanese and English, but I leave such an investigation to future work.\(^{14}\)

\(\text{(i) } \text{'Kare-wa kyoosi-ni nari-tai to omotte-iru ga, hontooni he-Top teacher-Dat become-want Quot think-Stat but really nari-tai no ka dooka, watasi-ni-wa wakara-nai. become-want NMLZ Q whether I-Dat-Top know-not} \)

\(\text{‘He thinks he wants to be a teacher, but I'm not sure he really wants to.'} \)

\(^{14}\) But see Wada (2008) for a comparative study of tense/mood phenomena in European languages in terms of the degree of public-self-centeredness.
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