

KOTOBA THEORY AND SPEECHOLOGY

SUSUMU EMOTO

Kotoba etymologically means *koto no ha* — *koto* designating something abstract and intangible and *ha* meaning 'the beginning of an event, happening, etc., or the place where things happen or start from'. *Koto no ha* may be literally interpreted as 'any clue to any abstracted concept' or more simply 'a clue to meaning', which is an entirely new and unique interpretation of the word.

Aya lexically means 'various forms, shapes, figures, colours, patterns, or designs that appear on the surface of anything'. It gathers from this that whatever appears or is manifested in terms of time and space, either physically or metaphysically, can be *koto no ha*, namely, an effective stimulus, a distinctive feature, an indexical feature actually for one's creation or realization of meaning, or a discrete unit for meaning, for which the term *aya* may be employed.

Now, *koto* and *ha*, like reality and appearance in Kantian phraseology, are interdependent, and one of them can only be reached or realized through the other. In other words, they are in complete interaction with each other. Even a kind of activity can be postulated between them. So, *kotoba* as a whole may be considered as implying some such meaningful activity. Likewise, the relation between *kotoba* as such meaningful activity and *aya* may be regarded as the relation between abstraction and concreteness. Thus, in my view, *kotoba* may be said to function always with some clue, physical or metaphysical, which is *aya*.

The word *idea* etymologically means 'a form, look, or appearance of a thing as opposed to its reality' and also 'to see' or 'to know'. On the other hand, *sentence* etymologically means 'way of thinking, opinion, sentiment' and also 'to feel' or 'to perceive', probably from *sentire*.

Now, it can be said that *aya* or *bun* (for both of which the same Japanese character is used and which corresponds to 'sentence' in English) is realized as such when it is perceived or manifested, out of which an opinion or idea might be formed. So, *kotoba* may entail generalization, abstraction, and also reasoning and judgement in the sense of forming an idea or opinion (about any matter) or power of comparing and deciding, that is, understanding. *Kotoba* thus happens. *Kotoba* is such a function, a sort of integration, or activity. Rather, it is life — a way of life.

Go designates 'I or we utter or express, or say, or speak'. The connotation embodied in the character might be both such activity and the result of such activity, namely, anything uttered or expressed in the hope that the object and other phenomena of the universe will create the same meaning or form the same idea or opinion as the subject himself. One, therefore, produces *go* as 'a clue to meaning' to the other party, which will probably be perceived or manifested as '*aya*'.

It will be convenient to set up three different categories: (a) the *kotoba* category that deals with the *kotoba* activity that takes place between the human being as a phenomenon of the universe and the rest of the phenomena of the universe. Essential agents here are *kotoba*, *aya* and *go*. (b) The *genko* category that is a sub-category to the *kotoba* category, which deals with the *genko* activity in relation to human beings only. So, all the so-called languages in the world are objects of study. Main agents are *genko*, *bun* and *wa* which corresponds to *go* of the *kotoba* category. Graphology is included here. (c) The speech (or language or linguistic) category that is the sub-category to the *genko* category, which deals with the speech (or linguistic) activity. Only the spoken aspect of language is the object of study. Essential agents are language, speech, sentence, sentence-marker, word, and word-marker. In brief, the word becomes a sentence-marker when it is decoded, and the sentence-marker, when it is manifested, becomes a sentence, which is encoded as a word-marker. Thus, the word-marker goes through the process of *aufheben* into *kotoba*. This is to be called a stimulus process. Then, with the *kotoba* as a stimulus, KOTOBA makes a response, resulting in the word. Then, we have to go round through all the linguistic process again. For this reason, it is a matter of course that for linguistic purposes the sentence as the unit of speech that is *aya* (or *go*) in disguise should be the object of study for the creation of a model for a speaker or a hearer. We could thus observe some features common to each other which are repeatedly manifested in the *kotoba* (or speech or linguistic in this case) activity. Such features can be abstracted, or linguistically analyzed, in other words, elementally articulated. Viewed in this light, de Saussure's claim that "dans la langue, un concept est une qualité de la substance phonique, comme une sonorité déterminée est une qualité du concept" is not altogether without reason. In this sense only, language could be represented as a reality. In the same way, a kind of phoneme could be realized as a kind of nuclear sound — a sound which, for instance, is actually taught as correct by a well-trained phonetician, that is, in other words, a model sound for the phonetic symbol.

Since there is a terminological confusion between phonology, *phonologie*, phonetics, *phonetik*, phonemics, *phonemik*, etc., for the discipline belonging exclusively to speaking, that is, speech, speechology will be a happy suggestion. As speech is nothing but thinking with voice, so thinking is nothing but speech without voice.

Lastly, it is of enthralling interest to learn that in Arabic '*kataba*' means 'he has written' (possibly in the brain), not *kotoba*, though.

I take it that for the sake of freedom, human understanding is a prerequisite in

a human society. Therefore, as to man living alone in the universe, there is an urgent need for freedom, that is, love, logos, life, language, and *kotoba* — the truth.

Aoyama Gakuin University

DISCUSSION

CHATTERJI (Calcutta)

I would like to know if, since *kotoba* was a Sino-Japanese word, the source of the concept, expressed in two Chinese characters, must be in Chinese. What was the original Chinese concept, to start with, and how and when was it modified in Japanese?

EMOTO

Probably the commonest Japanese equivalent of 'language' at large will be *gengo* (言言言). In China, if I am not mistaken, they say or write 言言言. 言言言 probably originated from a pictograph of a face with an open mouth (言言言), suggesting 'utterance, or speaking'. 言言言 consists of 言言言, and 言言言, the latter meaning 'I or we'.

We borrowed Chinese characters (言言言) for *kotoba*, meaning probably 'speaking' (言言言) and 'writing' because 言言言 designates 'leaf' on which something may have been written. Some scholars however, are of the opinion that *kotoba* originated from *koto no ha* (言言言), which can be interpreted as 'a clue to an abstraction'; and *kotoba* and *koto no ha* are typical Japanese, not Chinese at all.