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Everyone knows what is supposed to happen when two Englishmen who have never met before come face to face in a railway compartment—they start talking about the weather.

これは Peter Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction* (Penguin Books, 1974) の冒頭である。この本は今なおよく読まれている社会言語学の概論書であるが（現在第 4 版）、上記の書き出しで始まる第 1 章は、出版された年から数年後にあたり、かなりの数の大学で入試問題に採用されたことでも知られている。もちろん、イギリス人と天候の特異な関係はそのときはじめて話題になったことではないが、いろいろな意味で広く知られるようになった契機であったと思われる。

本書は、ちょうどその 30 年後の 2004 年に Hodder & Stoughton 社から出版され、ベストセラーとなった、*Watching the English: The Hidden Rules of English Behaviour* からの抜粋である。原著は Introduction と Part One: Conversation Codes, Part Two: Behaviour Codes, 及び Conclusion から成るが、本書はそこから一部をとり、大学のテキスト用に注釈をほどこしたものである。なお、テキストとしての構成上、unit に区分けて review 用の確認問題を設定することをお奨めしておきたい。

イギリス人の国民性をテーマにした書き物は、アダミックなもののから大衆的なものまでいくつかの世でもいろいろな形で私たちの目に触れることができる。なかでも「天候」「食べ物」「パブ」「行列」といった題材は正面から観えたり、あげつらったり、自尊的にさえぎられたり、あるいはときにはユーモアを交えて料理されてきた。

「イギリス人論」は、ウチから、ソトからと、いろいろな観点からの議論があるが、本書の特徴は文化人類学的な問題設定と著者自らによる実験的手法にある。つまり、ウチからの視点をもつ著者による客観的なデータ集めである。人類学的なやり方の基本は、フィールドワークにあり、そこから幅広く得られたデータを記述、分析していく。ただ、欲しいデータをピンポイントで収集するということに関しては効率的なやり方ではない。「欲しい」データを収集するひとつの方法は、心理学でよくみられるように、テーマを絞って「実験」をすることである。Fox はイギリス人の行動様式を鋭い観察眼で分析すると共に、自ら実験台となり、イギリス人の反応を調査している。本書に出てくる「ぶつかり実験」「行列の割り込み実験」はその最たるもので、Fox の面目躍如たるところである。原著は、このように生活や文化の様々な側面について、内省と実験から得られたデータを詳細に観察・記述し、イギリス人の行動パターンに隠れた規則性を見出そうとするものである。もちろん中心は「イギリス人の観察」であるが、折りに触れ、ほかの国民性との違いにも言及している。特に日本人との比較があり興味深い。

著者，Kate Fox はケンブリッジ大学卒の社会人類学者である。Oxford にある SIRC
(Social Issues Research Centre）のco-directorであり、Institute for Cultural ResearchのFellowでもある。研究者としての研究活動や社会科学に関する著作活動に加え、大学などでの招待講演、特別講義やテレビ・ラジオなどメディア等でも幅広く活躍している。

Drinking and Public Disorder (Peter Marsh と共著) (Portman Group, 1992)
Pubwatching with Desmond Morris (Sutton, 1993)
The Racing Tribe: Watching the Horsewatchers (Metro, 1999)

本書では二種類の注を用意した。学生者の解釈の助けになると思われる語句の意味、文法、構文、パラグラフ構成などに関する解説を、基本形を提示して各ページの横に付けた（以下「側注」と呼ぶ）。側注では、さらに、発音しにくい語には発音記号を表示し、これにより学習者の注意を喚起したり、主体的に考えさせるための問い合わせに対応した。

もう一つの注は、各ユニットの終わりに設け、ここでは原注をはじめ、英語に読める語や、専門的な語法・文法の注解や背景的情報の提供を行った。ただし、本来側注についての解説を、スペースの関係でここにまとまったものもある。

注釈で用いた略記は以下のことを表す。
s.t. → something / s.o. → someone / esp. → especially / fml. → formal / infml. → informal /
derog. → derogatory / BE → British English / AE → American English

また、本に参考にした辞書は以下の通りである。
Collins COBUILD Advanced Learner’s English Dictionary, HarperCollins, 2004。
Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary of Current English, Oxford University Press, 2005。

研究社新英和大辞典（第6版） 研究社 2002年
ジーニアス英和大辞典 大修館書店 2001年
ジーニアス英和辞典（第4版） 大修館書店 2006年
ユースプログレッシブ英和辞典 小学館 2004年

注釈に際しては細心の注意を払ったつもりではあるが、不備や誤解している箇所があるかもしれません。使用者各位のご教示をお願いする次第である。最後に、このテキストの企画、出版にあたってお世話になった方のお名前をあげて感謝の念を申し述べたい。原著を紹介していただいたロンドン在住の山口愛さんと企画を取り上げていた当時英宝社の宇治正夫氏である。このような形で出版できたのもお二人のおかげである。心からお礼申し上げる。
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UNIT 1
THE WEATHER
THE RULES OF ENGLISH WEATHER-SPEAK

The Reciprocity Rule
Jeremy Paxman cannot understand why a ‘middle-aged blonde’ he encounters outside the Met Office in Bracknell says ‘Ooh, isn’t it cold?’, and he puts this irrational behaviour down to a distinctively English ‘capacity for infinite surprise at the weather’. In fact, ‘Ooh, isn’t it cold?’—like ‘Nice day, isn’t it?’ and all the others—is English code for ‘I’d like to talk to you—will you talk to me?’, or, if you like, simply another way of saying ‘hello’. The hapless female was just trying to strike up a conversation with Mr. Paxman. Not necessarily a long conversation—just a mutual acknowledgement, an exchange of greetings. Under the rules of weather-speak, all he was required to say was ‘Mm, yes, isn’t it?’ or some other equally meaningless ritual response, which is code for ‘Yes, I’ll talk to you/greet you’. By failing to respond at all, Paxman committed a minor breach of etiquette, effectively conveying the rather discourteous message ‘No, I will not exchange greetings with you’. (This was not a serious transgression, however, as the rules of privacy and reserve override those of sociability: talking to strangers is never compulsory.)

We used to have another option, at least for some social situations, but the ‘How do you do?’ greeting (to which the apparently ludicrous correct response is to repeat the question back ‘How do you do?’) is now regarded by many as somewhat archaic, and is no longer the universal standard greeting. The ‘Nice day, isn’t it?’ exchange must, however, be understood in the same light, and not taken literally: ‘How do you do?’ is not a real question about health or well-being, and ‘Nice day, isn’t it?’ is not a real question about the weather.

Comments about the weather are phrased as questions (or with an interrogative intonation) because they require a response
—but the *reciprocity* is the point, not the content. Any interrogative remark on the weather will do to initiate the process, and any mumbled confirmation (or even near-repetition, as in ‘Yes, isn’t it?’) will do as a response. English weather-speak rituals often sound rather like a kind of catechism, or the exchanges between priest and congregation in a church: ‘Lord, have mercy upon us’, ‘Christ, have mercy upon us’; ‘Cold, isn’t it?’, ‘Yes, isn’t it?’, and so on.

It is not always quite that obvious, but all English weather conversations have a distinctive structure, an unmistakable rhythmic pattern, which to an anthropologist marks them out instantly as ‘ritual’. There is a clear sense that these are ‘choreographed’ exchanges, conducted according to unwritten but tacitly accepted rules.

15 *The Agreement Rule*

The English have clearly chosen a highly appropriate aspect of our own familiar natural world as a social facilitator: the capricious and erratic nature of our weather ensures that there is always something new to comment on, be surprised by, speculate about, moan about, or, perhaps most importantly, agree about. Which brings us to another important rule of English weather-speak: always agree. This rule was noted by the Hungarian humorist George Mikes, who wrote that in England ‘You must never contradict anybody when discussing the weather’.

We have already established that weather-speak greetings or openers such as ‘Cold, isn’t it?’ must be reciprocated, but etiquette also requires that the response express agreement, as in ‘Yes, isn’t it?’ or ‘Mmm, very cold’.

Failure to agree in this manner is a serious breach of etiquette. When the priest says ‘Lord, have mercy upon us’, you do not respond ‘Well, actually, why should he?’ You intone, dutifully, ‘Christ, have mercy upon us’. In the same way, it would be very rude to respond to ‘Ooh, isn’t it cold?’ with ‘No, actually, it’s quite mild’. If you listen carefully, as I have, to hundreds of English weather-conversations, you will find that such responses are extremely rare, almost unheard of. Nobody will tell you that there is a rule about this; they are not even conscious of
following a rule: it just simply isn’t done.

If you deliberately break the rule (as I duly did, on several occasions, in the interests of science), you will find that the atmosphere becomes rather tense and awkward, and possibly somewhat huffy. No one will actually complain or make a big scene about it (we have rules about complaining and making a fuss), but they will be offended, and this will show in subtle ways. There may be an uncomfortable silence, then someone may say, in piqued tones, ‘Well, it feels cold to me,’ or ‘Really? Do you think so?’—or, most likely, they will either change the subject or continue talking about the weather among themselves, politely, if frostily, ignoring your faux pas. In very polite circles, they may attempt to ‘cover’ your mistake by helping you to redefine it as a matter of taste or personal idiosyncrasy, rather than of fact. Among highly courteous people, the response to your ‘No, actually, it’s quite mild’ might be, after a slightly embarrassed pause, ‘Oh, perhaps you don’t feel the cold—you know, my husband is like that: he always thinks it’s mild when I’m shivering and complaining. Maybe women feel the cold more than men, do you think?’

26 censure: an expression of strong disapproval or harsh criticism.

31 touchy: easily upset, offended, or irritated.

34 belittle: to treat (s.t or s.o) as having little value or importance.

35 the high twenties 「30℃近く」

36 phew: 落とし言葉 <interj> used to express relief, fatigue, surprise, or disgust.

37 laughing and scoffing and saying の意味上の主語は？

The Weather-as-family Rule

While we may spend much of our time moaning about our weather, foreigners are not allowed to criticize it. In this respect, we treat the English weather like a member of our family: one can complain about the behaviour of one’s own children or parents, but any hint of censure from an outsider is unacceptable, and very bad manners.

Although we are aware of the relatively undramatic nature of the English weather—the lack of extreme temperatures, monsoons, tempests, tornadoes and blizzards—we become extremely touchy and defensive at any suggestion that our weather is therefore inferior or uninteresting. The worst possible weather-speak offence is one mainly committed by foreigners, particularly Americans, and that is to belittle the English weather. When the summer temperature reaches the high twenties, and we moan, ‘Phew, isn’t it hot?’, we do not take kindly to visiting Americans or Australians laughing and scoffing and saying ‘Call this
hot? This is nothing. You should come to Texas [Brisbane] if you wanna see hot!"

Not only is this kind of comment a serious breach of the agreement rule, and the weather-as-family rule, but it also represents a grossly quantitative approach to the weather, which we find coarse and distasteful. Size, we sniffily point out, isn’t everything, and the English weather requires an appreciation of subtle changes and understated nuances, rather than a vulgar obsession with mere volume and magnitude.

Indeed, the weather may be one of the few things about which the English are still unselfconsciously and unashamedly patriotic. During my participant-observation research on Englishness, which naturally involved many conversations about the weather, I came across this prickly defensiveness about our weather again and again, among people of all classes and social backgrounds. Contempt for American size-fixation was widespread—one outspoken informant (a publican) expressed the feelings of many when he told me: ‘Oh, with Americans it’s always “mine’s bigger than yours”, with the weather or anything else. They’re so crass. Bigger steaks, bigger buildings, bigger snowstorms, more heat, more hurricanes, whatever. No fucking subtlety, that’s their problem.’ Jeremy Paxman, rather more elegantly, but equally patriotically, dismisses all Bill Bryson’s monsoons, raging blizzards, tornadoes and hailstorms as ‘histrionics’. A very English put-down.
Notes

(1) Jeremy Paxman 1950年生まれのジャーナリスト・作家。現在BBCのNewsnightでプレゼンターを務め、英に衣を着ぬインタビューでよく知られている。その手厳しい質問の仕方を称して、「Paxmanesque」という言葉ができたほどである。

(2) Catechism カテキズム キリスト教の教理指導書。問答体の形をとることが多いため、「教理問答」「信仰問答」「公教要理」などの訳があれている。

(3) Which 関係代名詞の非制限用法。whichが文頭に出て、前の文の内容を受けている。コンマで続くのが一般的であるが、この例のように新しく文が始まる場合や漠然と前の段落で述べたことを先行詞とする場合もある（cf. p.62, l.16）。

(4) George Mikes (1912-1987) ハンガリア生まれ。1938年にジャーナリストとしてロンドンに派遣されて以来、ロンドンに在住して活動したユーモア作家。代表作はHow to be an Alien。他に日本についてのThe Land of the Rising Yenやアメリカに関するHow to Scrape Skiesなど多数。

(5) by helping you to re-define it as a matter of taste or personal idiosyncrasy, rather than of fact 「実際に寒くないかどうかというよりも、好みとか特異体質の問題だと言いたい話を使ってくれる」こと。

(6) take kindly to...＜通例否定文、疑問文、条件文で＞「快く（進んで）...を受け入れる」cf. She didn't take kindly to my advice（彼女は私の忠告にすんなり耳を貸さなかった）

(7) participant-observation 「参与観察（参加観察）」観察対象と一緒に活動しながら必要な情報を収集する方法。観察者はなるべく観察者であることを意識させないように振る舞い、相手と自然なコミュニケーションをしながら密かにデータ（情報）を収集する。文化人類学や都市社会学におけるフィールドワークから発展した。

(8) Bill Bryson 1951年生まれ。アメリカで生まれ、1977年イギリスで新聞社「インディペンデント」に勤務。約20年後アメリカに戻る。作品は言葉に関するエッセイ、紀行文が多く、そのほとんどがベストセラーとなっている。

Exercises

A) 本文の内容に即して、下の問いに答えなさい。

1. イギリスで“Ooh, isn’t it cold?”と話しかけられると、どういう返答をするのが良いとされているか。

2. 1のように返答しなければ、どういう意味を持つか。

3. the reciprocity rule はどういうルールか、例を挙げて簡単に説明しなさい。

4. お天気の同意のルールに従わなかった場合、まわりの雰囲気はどうなるか。
5. 4のような場合、その場に居合わせたイギリス人はどのように不快感を表してくるか。

6. イギリス人が天気を家族のように扱うというのはどういう点を指しているか。

7. もっともイギリス人が腹を立てそうな天気の話はどういうものか。

B) (　)の中に、下記語群から適当な語句を選んで入れなさい。

単語は一度しか使えない。

1. They’ll dance with the Kirov and (　) musical dance programs for network television.

2. Someone who is (　) often changes their mind unexpectedly.

3. It was not long before I realised the enormity of my (　).

4. A (　) situation or period of time is one that makes people anxious, because they do not know what is going to happen next.

5. He is investigating a possible (　) of the Official Secrets Act through unauthorized use of the Central Police Computer to obtain classified information.

6. He ordered her to appear today before Bruce Crawford, the Chief Whip, who is expected to (　) her.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>capricious</th>
<th>aloof</th>
<th>tense</th>
<th>congregation</th>
<th>choreograph</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breach</td>
<td>censure</td>
<td>faux pas</td>
<td>catechism</td>
<td>census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idiosyncratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT 2
GROOMING-TALK
THE RULES OF INTRODUCTION

Awkwardness Rules

As it is, our introductions and greetings tend to be uncomfortable, clumsy and inelegant. Among established friends, there is less awkwardness, although we are often still not quite sure what to do with our hands, or whether to hug or kiss. The French custom of a kiss on each cheek has become popular among the chattering classes and some other middle- and upper-middle-class groups, but is regarded as silly and pretentious by many other sections of society, particularly when it takes the form of the ‘air-kiss’. Women who use this variant (and it is only women; men do not air-kiss, unless they are very camp gays, and even then it is done ‘ironically’) are disparagingly referred to as ‘Mwah-Mwahs’. Even in the social circles where cheek-kissing is acceptable, one can still never be entirely sure whether one kiss or two is required, resulting in much awkward hesitation and bumping as the parties try to second-guess each other.

Handshakes are now the norm in business introductions—or rather, they are the norm when people in business are introduced to each other for the first time. Ironically, the first introduction, where a degree of formality is expected, is the easiest. (Note, though, that the English handshake is always somewhat awkward, very brief, performed ‘at arm’s length’, and without any of the spare-hand involvement—clapping, forearm patting, etc.—found in less inhibited cultures.)

At subsequent meetings, particularly as business contacts get to know each other better, a handshake greeting often starts to seem too formal, but cheek-kisses would be too informal (or too pretentious, depending on the social circle), and in any case not allowed between males, so we revert to the usual embarrassed confusion, with no-one being quite sure what to do. Hands are half-extended and then withdrawn or turned into a sort of
vague wave; there may be awkward, hesitant moves towards a cheek-kiss or some other form of physical contact such as an arm-touch—as no contact at all feels a bit unfriendly—but these are also often aborted half-way. This is excruciatingly English: over-formality is embarrassing, but so is an inappropriate degree of informality (that problem with extremes again).

*The No-name Rule*

In purely social situations, the difficulties are even more acute. There is no universal prescription of handshakes on initial introduction—indeed, they may be regarded as too ‘businesslike’—and the normal business practice of giving one’s name at this point is also regarded as inappropriate. You do not go up to someone at a party (or in any other social setting where conversation with strangers is permitted, such as a pub bar counter) and say ‘Hello, I’m John Smith,’ or even ‘Hello, I’m John.’ In fact, the only correct way to introduce yourself in such settings is not to introduce yourself at all, but to find some other way of initiating a conversation—such as a remark about the weather.

The ‘brash American’ approach: ‘Hi, I’m Bill from Iowa,’ particularly if accompanied by an outstretched hand and beaming smile, makes the English wince and cringe. The American tourists and visitors I spoke to during my research had been both baffled and hurt by this reaction. ‘I just don’t get it,’ said one woman. ‘You say your name and they sort of wrinkle their noses, like you’ve told them something a bit too personal and embarrassing.’ ‘That’s right,’ her husband added. ‘And then they give you this tight little smile and say “Hello”—kind of pointedly *not* giving their name, to let you know you’ve made this big social booboo. What the hell is so private about a person’s name, for God’s sake?’

I ended up explaining, as kindly as I could, that the English do not want to know your name, or tell you theirs, until a much greater degree of intimacy has been established—like maybe when you marry their daughter. Rather than giving your name, I suggested, you should strike up a conversation by making a vaguely interrogative comment about the weather (or the party or pub or wherever you happen to be). This must not be done

4 abort: If s.o aborts a process, plan, or activity, they stop it before it has been completed. *excruciatingly*: un-bearably.

14 such as a pub bar counter → UNIT 9 参照。

19 brash: showing a disrespectful or showy self-confidence.

21 wince and cringe (顔をしかめてたじろぐ)

23 baffled: puzzled.

25 like 接続詞. 口語的な使い方. 33行のlikeも同様.

27- pointedly 『当てつければましく、あからさまに』怒りや非難の感情が含意される。

29 social booboo 『世間でのへま、失敗』

30 for God’s sake ⇒ Notes (3)

36 vaguely interrogative comment がよいのはなぜか.
2 drift into 「知らず不知…にはまる」
4 curb: to control.
9 Should you reach 倒置の理由は？
11 er 間接詞、「あー、あのー、えーと」話の途中で休んだり、ためらったりするときなどに用いる。
13 divulge / <BE> darvaldz, <AM> dr-「打ち明ける」
14 offhand: casual.
17 perceptive: showing an unusually good ability to notice and understand.
19 Alice Through the Looking Glass ⇒ Notes (4)
19-the wrong way round: the other way around. 「あべこべに」

too loudly, and the tone should be light and informal, not earnest or intense. The object is to ‘drift’ casually into conversation, as though by accident. Even if the other person seems happy enough to chat, it is still customary to curb any urges to introduce yourself.

Eventually, there may be an opportunity to exchange names, providing this can be achieved in a casual, unforced manner, although it is always best to wait for the other person to take the initiative. Should you reach the end of a long, friendly evening without having introduced yourself, you may say, on parting, ‘Goodbye, nice to meet you, er, oh—I didn’t catch your name?’ as though you have only just noticed the omission. Your new acquaintance should then divulge his or her name, and you may now, at last, introduce yourself—but in an offhand way, as though it is not a matter of any importance: ‘I’m Bill, by the way.’

One perceptive Dutch tourist, after listening attentively to my explanation of this procedure commented: ‘Oh, I see. It is like Alice Through the Looking Glass: you do everything the wrong way round.’ I had not thought of recommending Alice as a guide to English etiquette, but on reflection it seems like quite a good idea.

---

Notes

(1) chattering classes 政治・社会活動に積極的に参加し、高い学歴を持つmiddle classのエリート層を指す。「chatterati」という用語がchattering classesの代わりに使われることもある。「commentariat」とは同義。

(2) sort of hedge (ヘッジ、垣根言葉) の一種。断定を避けたり、ポライトネスの効果のために用いられる。同じ働きをする語句に、p. 14, l. 27のkind ofやp. 14, l. 33のmaybe、他にI wonder、I think、perhaps、rather、in a wayなど。

(3) for God’s sake 诅咒（誓願、のしり語）で。For God’s [Christ’s, Heaven’s, Pete’s] sake, can you stop crying? に似て、神に関わる語を入れて、驚き、願いの強調、拒絶などを表す語句。日本語には相当する語句が少ないので日本語に訳しにくいものの代表格とされる。最近ではセックスや排泄に関わる語ののしり語として用いられる。→ p. 10, l. 22.

(4) Alice Through the Looking Glass 邦題は「鏡の国のアリス」「不思議の国のアリス」(Alice's Adventures in Wonderland, 1865)の続編として、1871年にLewis Carrollによって書かれた児童文学で、対称や時間の逆転を含めた鏡像のイメージが多い。「不思議の国のアリス」が5月の暑い日に始まるのに対して「鏡の国のアリス」は11月の雪の夜から始まる。
A) 本文の内容に即して、下の問いに答えなさい。

1. イギリス人が仕事の上で初対面の人と握手をする際の特徴を挙げなさい。

2. 仕事で何度か顔をあわせ、知り合いになってきた際に、挨拶の方法はどのように変わるか説明しなさい。

3. 仕事以外の社交の場で初対面の人と話す際、先ず何から始めればよいとされているか。

4. アメリカ人旅行者が初対面のイギリス人と会話をする際、先ず問題になる点は何か。

B) （ ）の中に、下記語群から適当な語句を選んで入れなさい。 単語は一度しか使えない。

1. There’s nothing (  ) about him. He is very modest and speaks little of his wealthy family.

2. He (  ) to eating meat after being a vegetarian for 20 years.

3. She is very (  ), and finds it difficult to express her feelings.

4. We have also uncovered vital new evidence about the six markings on the cartridge case which (  ) detectives.

5. But she can’t have spotted them, otherwise I’m sure she’d have (  ) her plan and returned to the house.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>offhand</th>
<th>baffled</th>
<th>inhibited</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ruffled</td>
<td>excruciatingly</td>
<td>reverted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pretentious</td>
<td>pretension</td>
<td>aborted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT 3
GROOMING-TALK
THE RULES OF ENGLISH GOSSIP 1

Privacy Rules
In quoting the research findings on the pervasiveness of English gossip above, I am not suggesting that the English gossip any more than people in other cultures. I am sure that studies elsewhere would also find about two-thirds of conversation time dedicated to much the same social matters. The researcher responsible for the English findings (the psychologist Robin Dunbar) is convinced that this is a universal human trait, and indeed maintains that language evolved to allow humans to gossip—as a substitute for the physical ‘social grooming’ of our primate ancestors, which became impractical among the much wider human social networks.

What I am suggesting is that gossip may be particularly important to the English, because of our obsession with privacy. When I conducted interviews and focus-group discussions on gossip with English people of different ages and social backgrounds, it became clear that their enjoyment of gossip had much to do with the element of ‘risk’ involved. Although most of our gossip is fairly innocuous (criticism and negative evaluations of others account for only five per cent of gossip time), it is still talk about people’s ‘private’ lives, and as such involves a sense of doing something naughty or forbidden.

The ‘invasion of privacy’ involved in gossip is particularly relevant for the reserved and inhibited English, for whom privacy is an especially serious matter. It is impossible to overstate the importance of privacy in English culture. Jeremy Paxman points out that: ‘The importance of privacy informs the entire organization of the country, from the assumptions on which laws are based, to the buildings in which the English live.’ George Orwell observes that: ‘The most hateful of all names in an English ear is Nosy Parker.’
I would add that a disproportionate number of our most influential social rules and maxims are concerned with the maintenance of privacy: we are taught to mind our own business, not to pry, to keep ourselves to ourselves, not to make a scene or a fuss or draw attention to ourselves, and never to wash our dirty linen in public. It is worth noting here that ‘How are you?’ is only treated as a ‘real’ question among very close personal friends or family; everywhere else, the automatic, ritual response is ‘Fine, thanks’, ‘OK, thanks’, ‘Oh, mustn’t grumble’, ‘Not bad, thanks’ or some equivalent, whatever your physical or mental state. If you are terminally ill, it is acceptable to say ‘Not bad, considering’.

As a result, thanks to the inevitable forbidden-fruit effect, we are a nation of curtain-twitchers, endlessly fascinated by the tabooed private lives of the ‘members of our social setting’. The English may not gossip much more than any other culture, but our privacy rules significantly enhance the value of gossip. The laws of supply and demand ensure that gossip is a precious social commodity among the English. ‘Private’ information is not given away lightly or cheaply to all and sundry, but only to those we know and trust.

This is one of the reasons why foreigners often complain that the English are cold, reserved, unfriendly and stand-offish. In most other cultures, revealing basic personal data—your name, what you do for a living, whether you are married or have children, where you live—is no big deal: in England, extracting such apparently trivial information from a new acquaintance can be like pulling teeth—every question makes us wince and recoil.

**The Guessing-game Rule**

It is not considered entirely polite, for example, to ask someone directly ‘What do you do?’, although if you think about it, this is the most obvious question to put to a new acquaintance, and the easiest way to start a conversation. But in addition to our privacy scruples, we English seem to have a perverse need to make social life difficult for ourselves, so etiquette requires us to find a more roundabout, indirect way of discovering what
people do for a living. It can be most amusing to listen to the tortured and devious lengths to which English people will go to ascertain a new acquaintance’s profession without actually asking the forbidden question. The guessing game, which is played at almost every middle-class social gathering where people are meeting each other for the first time, involves attempting to guess a person’s occupation from ‘clues’ in remarks made about other matters.

A comment about traffic problems in the local area, for example, will elicit the response ‘Oh, yes, it’s a nightmare—and the rush hour is even worse: do you drive to work?’ The other person knows exactly what question is really intended, and will usually obligingly answer the unspoken enquiry as well as the spoken one, saying something like: ‘Yes, but I work at the hospital, so at least I don’t have to get into the town centre.’ The questioner is now allowed to make a direct guess: ‘Oh, the hospital—you’re a doctor, then?’ (When two or three possible occupations are indicated, it is polite to name the highest-status one as a first guess—doctor rather than nurse, porter or medical student; solicitor rather than secretary. Also, even though an explicit guess is permitted at this stage, it is best expressed as an interrogative statement, rather than as a direct question.)

Everyone knows the rules of this game, and most people tend to offer helpful ‘clues’ early in the conversation, to speed the process along. Even if you are shy, embarrassed about your job, or trying to be enigmatic, it is considered very rude to prolong the clue-hunting stage of the game for too long, and once someone makes an explicit guess, you are obliged to reveal your occupation. It is almost equally impolite to ignore any obvious ‘clue-dropping’ by your new acquaintance. If (to continue the medical theme) he or she mentions in passing that ‘My surgery is just round the corner from here’, you are honour-bound to hazard a guess: ‘Oh, so—you’re a GP?’

When the person’s occupation is finally revealed, it is customary, however boring or predictable this occupation might be, to express surprise. The standard response to ‘Yes, I am a doctor [or teacher, accountant, IT manager, secretary, etc.],’ is ‘Oh, really?!’ as though the occupation were both unexpected.
and fascinating. This is almost invariably followed by an embarrassed pause, as you search desperately for an appropriate comment or question about the person’s profession and—he or she tries to think of something modest, amusing, but somehow also impressive, to say in response.

Similar guessing-game techniques are often used to find out where people live, whether they are married, what school or university they went to, and so on. Some direct questions are more impolite than others. It is less rude, for example, to ask ‘Where do you live?’ than ‘What do you do?’, but even this relatively inoffensive question is much better phrased in a more indirect manner, such as ‘Do you live nearby?’, or even more obliquely ‘Have you come far?’ It is more acceptable to ask whether someone has children than to ask whether he or she is married, so the former question is generally used as a roundabout way of prompting clues that will provide the answer to the latter. (Many married English males do not wear wedding rings, so the children question is often used by single females to encourage them to reveal their marital status. This can only be done in an appropriate conversational context, however, as asking the children question ‘out of the blue’ would be too obvious an attempt to ascertain a male’s availability.)

The guessing-game rituals allow us, eventually, to elicit this kind of rudimentary census-form information, but the English privacy rules ensure that any more interesting details about our lives and relationships are reserved for close friends and family. This is ‘privileged’ information, not to be bandied about indiscriminately. The English take a certain pride in this trait, and sneer at the stereotyped Americans who ‘tell you all about their divorce, their hysterectomy and their therapist within five minutes of meeting you’. This cliché, although not entirely without foundation, probably tells us more about the English and our privacy rules than it does about the Americans.

Incidentally, the English privacy rules, especially the taboo on ‘prying’, can make life quite difficult for the hapless social researcher whose life-blood data can only be obtained by constant prying. Many of the findings in this book were discovered the hard way, by pulling metaphorical teeth, or, more often, des-
stratagem
/st्रαtədʒəm/ 「戦略、計略」

distance rule ⇒
Notes (7)

---

1. *stratagem* /strətədʒəm/ [戦略, 計略]

2. *distance rule* ⇒

---

---

Notes


2. **language evolved to allow humans to gossip** 〈原注〉There are of course other theories of language evolution, the most appealing of which is Geoffrey Miller’s proposition that language evolved as a courtship device—to enable us to flirt. Fortunately, the ‘chat-up’ theory of language evolution is not incompatible with the ‘gossip’ theory, providing one accepts that gossip has multiple functions, including status-display for courtship purposes.


4. **curtain-twitchers** 元来 twitcher は <BE ifml> で enthusiastic bird-watcher のこと。本文では比喻的に、他人の私生活に関心を持つ人を指す。原著 (pp. 115–6) に次のような記述がある。「lower-middle と upper-working class の人は、道路に面した居間で他人に覗かれないように、窓にレースのカーテンをつける。これは、階級の指標となるもののの、私のように [のぞき見] 調査をする者にとっては、邪魔になって都合が悪い。」

5. **solicitor** イギリスで、正式の法廷弁護士 barrister に対し、依頼された事件の書類作成などの法律事務を行う弁護士を solicitor と呼ぶ。日本や米国には barrister と solicitor の区別はない。

6. **GP** イギリスの National Health Service (NHS) 制度のもとでは患者の診療負担はないが、診療・入院が極端に制限され、緊急でない場合は何か月も待たれる。そのため国民の10人に1人が民間保険に加入して診療を受けるが、ほとんどの場合、先ず一般開業医である GP が科の区別なく住民のプライマリケアを担当し、さらに高次の医療が必要と判断した場合には専門医のいる病院を紹介する。

7. **distance rule** 「ゴシップの対象となる人物が自分から遠いほど、そのゴシップをする相手の輪も大きくなる」というルール。つまり、自分自身の私的事柄は親友にしか話さないが、家族や友達の私生活についてなら、話し合う相手の範囲がもう少し拡がる。さらに知り合い、仕事仲間、近隣住民のうわさ話はもっと範囲が拡がり、有名人の私事なら誰にでも話せるということ。（原著 pp. 46–7 参照）
A) 本文の内容に即して、下の問いに答えなさい。

1. イギリス人はプライバシーを非常に尊重する国民であるが、gossipで人の噂話をするのが大好きだという一見矛盾する現象を、Foxはどのように説明しているか。

2. 外国人がイギリス人を冷淡でよそよそしく友好的でないと感じる理由を述べなさい。

3. middle classのイギリス人が、初対面の相手の職業を言い当てまでの手順を、ルールに則って説明しなさい。

B) （ ）の中に、下記語群から適当な語句を選んで入れなさい。
　単語は一度しか使えない。

1. I wish you could get rid of this total ( ) with money and think about me for a change.

2. Don’t be so nosy. Can’t you ( )?

3. Essex Police admitted that questioning the Afghans was “like pulling ( )”.

4. Trade is the city’s ( ).

5. He was a ( ), always interfering in other people’s business.

6. The spiritual teacher was a(n) ( ) person.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>teeth</th>
<th>strings</th>
<th>nosy parker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enigmatic</td>
<td>dark horse</td>
<td>epidemic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lifeblood</td>
<td>mind your own business</td>
<td>obsession</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


UNIT 4
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1 sex differences ⇒ Notes (1)
2 researchers ⇒ Notes (2)

5 social: relating to leisure activities that involve meeting other people.
(cf. social club, social dance)
9 football イギリスでは通例「サッカー」を指す。
11 no more likely than women to do 「男性は」女性（が…しまうもないの）
と同様に…しない
12 highbrow: intellectual, academic and often difficult to understand.

Sex Differences in English Gossip Rules
Contrary to popular belief, researchers have found that men gossip just as much as women. In one English study, both sexes devoted the same amount of conversation time (about 65 per cent) to social topics such as personal relationships; in another, the difference was found to be quite small, with gossip accounting for 55 per cent of male conversation time and 67 per cent of female time. As sport and leisure have been shown to occupy about 10 per cent of conversation time, discussion of football could well account for the difference.

Men were certainly found to be no more likely than women to discuss ‘important’ or ‘highbrow’ subjects such as politics, work, art and cultural matters—except (and this was a striking difference) when women were present. On their own, men gossip, with no more than five per cent of conversation time devoted to non-social subjects such as work or politics. It is only in mixed-sex groups, where there are women to impress, that the proportion of male conversation time devoted to these more ‘highbrow’ subjects increases dramatically, to between 15 and 20 percent.

In fact, recent research has revealed only one significant difference, in terms of content, between male and female gossip: men spend much more time talking about themselves. Of the total time devoted to conversation about social relationships, men spend two thirds talking about their own relationships, while women only talk about themselves one third of the time.

Despite these findings, the myth is still widely believed, particularly among males, that men spend their conversations ‘solving the world’s problems’, while the womenfolk gossip in the kitchen. In my focus groups and interviews, most English males initially claimed that they did not gossip, while most of the fe-

30 focus group ⇒ Notes (3)
males readily admitted that they did. On further questioning, however, the difference turned out to be more a matter of semantics than practice: what the women were happy to call ‘gossip’, the men defined as ‘exchanging information’.

Clearly, there is a stigma attached to gossip among English males, an unwritten rule to the effect that even if what one is doing is gossiping, it should be called something else. Perhaps even more important: it should sound like something else. In my gossip research, I found that the main difference between male and female gossip is that female gossip actually sounds like gossip. There seem to be three principal factors involved: the tone rule, the detail rule and the feedback rule.

The Tone Rule
The English women I interviewed all agreed that a particular tone of voice was considered appropriate for gossip. The gossip-tone should be high and quick, or sometimes a stage whisper, but always highly animated. ‘Gossip’s got to start with something like [quick, high-pitched, excited tone] “Oooh—Guess what? Guess what?”’ explained one woman, or “Hey, listen, listen [quick, urgent, stage-whisper]—you know what I heard?”

Another told me: ‘You have to make it sound surprising or scandalous, even when it isn’t really. You’ll go, “Well, don’t tell anyone, but . . .” even when it’s not really that big of a secret’

Many of the women complained that men failed to adopt the correct tone of voice, recounting items of gossip in the same flat, unemotional manner as any other piece of information, such that, as one woman sniffed, ‘You can’t even tell it’s gossip.’ Which, of course, is exactly the impression the males wish to give.

The Detail Rule
Females also stressed the importance of detail in the telling of gossip, and again bemoaned the shortcomings of males in this matter, claiming that men ‘never know the details’. ‘Men just don’t do the he-said-she-said thing,’ one informant told me, ‘and it’s no good unless you actually know what people said.’ Another said: ‘Women tend to speculate more . . . They’ll talk
about *why* someone did something, give a history to the situation.’ For women, this detailed speculation about possible motives and causes, requiring an exhaustive raking over ‘history’, is a crucial element of gossip, as is detailed speculation about possible outcomes. English males find all this detail boring, irrelevant and, of course, un-manly.

The Feedback Rule

Among English women, it is understood that to be a ‘good gossip’ requires more than a lively tone and attention to detail: you also need a good audience, by which they mean appreciative listeners who give plenty of appropriate feedback. The feedback rule of female gossip requires that listeners be at least as animated and enthusiastic as speakers. The reasoning seems to be that this is only polite: the speaker has gone to the trouble of making the information sound surprising and scandalous, so the least one can do is to reciprocate by sounding suitably shocked. English men, according to my female informants, just don’t seem to have grasped this rule. They do not understand that ‘You are supposed to say “NO! Really?” and “Oh my GOD!”’

My female informants agreed, however, that a man who did respond in the approved female manner would sound inappropriately girly, or even disturbingly effeminate. Even the gay males I interviewed felt that the ‘NO! Really?’ kind of response would be regarded as decidedly ‘camp’. The unwritten rules of English gossip etiquette do allow men to express shock or surprise when they hear a particularly juicy bit of gossip, but it is understood that a suitable expletive conveys such surprise in a more acceptably masculine fashion.
イギリスの階級制度

18世紀の産業革命以降，それまでの支配階級であった王・貴族らの upper class の下位に，工業革命の影響が及んで経済的に実力を持つようになった。彼らは middle class と呼ばれ，上・中・下の3段階に分けられることが多い。その下の庶民は working class と呼ばれる。この5分野による階層の特徴や職業をまとめてみる。

| upper | 貴族，代々の富裕領主 | 先祖代々の土地や資産を受け継ぐ。ビジネスで多大な利益を上げることに誇る。
| upper-middle | 役人，医者，学者，官僚，建築家，軍幹部 | 高い教育水準，文化的リーダーシップをにげる。BBC English を話す。
| middle-middle | 地元企業の経営者，大企業の中間管理職，農場主，新聞記者，教師 | BBC English に地元のアクセントが少々混ざった，独特の話し方をする人も多い。
| lower-middle | 不動産業者，製図工，写真家，銀行事務員，秘書，警官 | ホワイトカラーだが，大学を卒業していない場合が多い，“Pardon?”と聞き返すことが多いと言われる。
| lower | バス運転手，コック，大工，家具職人，配管工，農場労働者，士木作業員，漁師 | ブルーカラーの仕事に従事し，地元アクセントを持ち英語を話す。サッカー観戦や大衆紙講読を最も好む。

とはいえ，特に中間階の3グループなどは職業だけではなく，教育，文化面など様々な要因が関与している。階級の移動はほとんどなく，不満も特に間かれない。lower class 出身であっても高い教育を身につけた人ももちろんいるが，バブルがスクールや大学は，裕福なupper-middle以上の人子が通うのが一般的である。結果，彼らはそれ相応の学業につくこととなり，階級の再生産につながっていくのである。
Exercises

A) 本文の内容に即して、下の問いに答えなさい。

1. 世間の常識としては、ゴシップの男女差はどのように思われているか。
2. 近年の調査では、どのようなことが分かったか。
3. 特に男性の間で、自分たちは嘘話ではなく、もっと高尚な話をしているという神話がなくならないのは、何が原因だと述べられているか。
4. ゴシップの話し方の面で、男女の特徴の違いを述べなさい。

B) （ ）の中に、下記語群から適当な語句を選んで入れなさい。
単語は一度しか使えない。

1. If something has a ( ) attached to it, people think it is something to be ashamed of.
2. If there is a four-sided figure ( ) three of its angles are 90°, the remaining angle will also be 90°.
3. The government made a statement ( ) it's against the war.
4. It was a ( ). It is unclear on what basis they made the determination that one claim was more credible than the other.
5. People with a mental illness, for instance, are ( ) anyone else to harm strangers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stigma</th>
<th>no more likely than</th>
<th>no more than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he-said she-said thing</td>
<td>wet blanket</td>
<td>matter of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>such that</td>
<td>to the effect that</td>
<td>so that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIT 5
HUMOUR RULES
IRONY RULES 1

The English are not usually given to patriotic boasting—indeed, both patriotism and boasting are regarded as unseemly, so the combination of these two sins is doubly distasteful. But there is one significant exception to this rule, and that is the patriotic pride we take in our sense of humour, particularly in our expert use of irony. The popular belief is that we have a better, more subtle, more highly developed sense of humour than any other nation, and specifically that other nations are all tediously literal in their thinking and incapable of understanding or appreciating irony. Almost all of the English people I interviewed subscribed to this belief, and many foreigners, rather surprisingly, humbly concurred.

Although we seem to have persuaded ourselves and a great many others of our superior sense of irony, I remain, as I have already indicated, not entirely convinced. Humour is universal; irony is a universally important ingredient of humour: no single culture can possibly claim a monopoly on it. My research suggests that, yet again, the irony issue is a question of degree—a matter of quantity rather than quality. What is unique about English humour is the pervasiveness of irony and the importance we attach to it. Irony is the dominant ingredient in English humour, not just a piquant flavouring. Irony rules. The English, according to an acute observer of the minutiae of Englishness, are 'conceived in irony. We float in it from the womb. It’s the amniotic fluid... Joking but not joking. Caring but not caring. Serious but not serious.'

It must be said that many of my foreign informants found this aspect of Englishness frustrating, rather than amusing: ‘The problem with the English,’ complained one American visitor, ‘is that you never know when they are joking—you never know whether they are being serious or not’. This was a business-

1 are given to 「…に（息、全霊を）さげる」
2 unseemly 「下品な、ふざけなくな

9 tediously literal 「退屈なほど文字通りのとり方をする」
11 subscribe to: agree with.
12 concur: <fln> to agree with someone or have the same opinion as someone else.
13 persuade A of B 「AにBを説得する」 Aに当たるのがourselvesとagreat many others.
15 not entirely 部分否定.
17 a monopoly on it itは何を指すか。
22 piquant 「辛みの効いた、びりっとしたもの」
Irony rules ruleは動詞.
23 an acute observer ⇒ Notes (1)
minutiæ/minjuddii/
[些細なこと]
24 are conceived in... 「...の中で生まれる」 conceiveは「妊娠する」の意.
25 amniotic fluid 「羊水」皮膚を羊水にたとえている.
Joking but not jok-
ing ⇒ Notes (2)
31 they are being se-
roug ⇒ Notes (3)