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GRAMMATICAL ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative case (kara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>accusative case (o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>allative case (e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative affix (sase)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>sentential complementizer (no, koto, tokoro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COND</td>
<td>conditional affix (-ba, -tara, -to, -nara)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>conjectural form (daroo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP</td>
<td>copula (da, de aru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative case (ni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>desiderative affix (-tai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>genitive case (no)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>gerund affix (-te)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>honorific morpheme (go, o-V ni naru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR</td>
<td>hortative affix (-yoo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUM</td>
<td>humble form of verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INS</td>
<td>instrumental case (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative case (ni, de, e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negative morpheme (-nai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative case (ga)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAS</td>
<td>passive affix (rare)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfect affix (te-iru)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POL</td>
<td>polite affix (-masu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POT</td>
<td>potential affix (rare, re)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>progressive affix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>question particle (ka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUOT</td>
<td>quotative marker (to)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFP</td>
<td>sentential final particle (yo, zo, ne, na, wa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>topic marker (wa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VOL</td>
<td>volitional affix (u)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*X* X is ungrammatical.

?X X is on the borderline between grammatical and ungrammatical.

He (his/him/himself) stands for both male and female except where otherwise indicated.
OVERVIEW

Introduction surveys the previous treatments of these response particles, both in dictionaries, and Japanese textbooks, also those by Japanese grammarians particularly Kitagawa and Hinata. We highlight the reasons why these treatments are inadequate, noting especially their failure to distinguish between semantic and socio-pragmatic influences. In addition we also describe also our methodological approach.

Chapter 1 introduces the notions of speaker and addressee orientedness. This notion forms the basis of a sub-categorization of the response particles that is elementary to our analysis.

In Chapter 2 we analyse the speaker-oriented response particles ああ and うん and attempt to explicate their semantic components. In Chapter 3 we analyse the addressee-oriented response particles はい, はあ and ええ and attempt to explicate their semantic components.

In Chapter 4 we view the semantic components (described in Chapters 2 and 3), in terms of such socio-pragmatic features as age, gender, roles etc. While we considered it crucial that semantic and socio-pragmatic components are treated independently it is our intention in this chapter to finally present meanings of the response particles based on both semantic and socio-pragmatic aspects of their usage.
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Introduction

This sub-thesis is an attempt to explicate the meanings of five Japanese response particles [hereafter RPs] "hai, haa, ee, aa, un" from the semantic - socio-pragmatic point of view¹. They are most frequently used either as a response, or preceding a response to a prior utterance, and they convey to the addressee the speaker's reaction to that utterance. They have been classified as kandooshi (exclamation particle)² in traditional Japanese grammar. They have been neglected by linguists to explicate their lexical core meaning, since they have been highlighted their function in the speech situation.

For example:

Question

(1) "Nihonjin desu ka?"
   Japanese COP Q
   POL
   "Are you Japanese?"

Response

a: "Hai."
b: "Haa."
c: "Ee."
d: "Aa."
e: "Un."

These five RPs are interpreted in English as:
"Yes, I am."

¹ We should explain that we are using the term "socio-linguistics" roughly in Leech's sense.
² See Morita, 1984:230. Suzuki also classifies these particles as exclamation particles. However he differentiates aa from the other four particles (hai, haa, ee, un) as a pure exclamation particle.
They also frequently occur, either sentence-initially, sentence- internally or sentence-finally as supportive response particles. For instance, in the following examples (2), un occurs in the sentence- internal position and hai occurs at the sentence-initial and sentence- final positions (3).

(2) "A sooiyu no wa betsumi unh kamawanai to
ah so say COM TOP especially mind QUOT
PLA
NEG

omou." 3

think NEG

"I think that will do."

(3) "Hai onna no minoue desu kara ne hai." 4

woman GEN circumstances COP since SEP

"Well, it's because I am just a poor woman."

Each of these RPs is an invariant minimal morpheme and constitutes a one-word utterance. They are semantically and pragmatically diverse, but do not show any syntactic features, for example, they do not show any case-agreement. Each of these RPs has semantically different meanings of which even most native speakers are not explicitly aware. The consideration of their use is complicated, since they are an amalgam of the fields of phonology, semantics, pragmatics and paralinguistic factors. In order to unravel the


4 Nihonkokugodaijiten, 1975, 16:95.
complexities of these RPs, it is necessary to take the following steps. Firstly we must deduce the semantic similarities and differences from an analysis of the diverse uses of each RP, in order to establish the core meaning (i.e. "... one which would hit all the types of context in which this particle has been observed to appear."\(^5\)) which unifies the principle that a native speaker of the language can control his language behaviour (Lyons 1977:25-29). Secondly and inevitably, these RPs should be considered within their discourse context, since their main function is to serve in the interaction between the speaker and the addressee as a response to some given stimulus. Discourse based observation enables us to combine the core meaning with other pragmatic factors in order to obtain the whole meaning of each RP. Finally the meaning of each RP will be presented through its semantic - socio-pragmatic components (Chapter 4).

The area of phonology (mainly stress and intonation) has not been touched on here for the following reasons: whilst we agree that intonation and stress should be taken into account, they serve distinctly separate purposes, having their own meanings. Therefore they should be considered in isolation, for they are different from the semantic meaning of the individual word they effect. In other words, the semantic meaning of the RP (or its core meaning) remains constant regardless of intonation.

\(^5\) Wierzbicka 1976:333
For example:
As a response:

(4): \[\text{ee} \rightarrow \text{6} \]
"Yes, (it's something like that.)"

(5): \[\text{ee} \rightarrow \text{,...} \]
"Yes, (that's right)."

Here ee, which can be interpreted as an affirmative, has the degree of affirmation modulated by the stress and intonation in a given situation. With a sustained intonation, ee can be interpreted as "Yes, it's something like that.". The degree of affirmation is increased by the sharply falling intonation of the speaker's voice. Ee can be interpreted as meaning "Yes, that's right." with the sharply falling intonation. Thus, the different intonation contours are not inherent in the semantic property of ee. The core meaning (affirmation) stays the same, but intonation modulates the degree of affirmation.

In this way, whatever the expression, be it an utterance, cry, even a groan, the same stereotype intonation (e.g., the sharply falling intonation) serves the same purpose which, in this instance, is to strengthen the speaker's certainty or emphasis of the proposition (Kitagawa 1977:71, Ladefoged 1982:103, Schourup 1985:92). In English "ee", might be written as follows:

"Yes, Yes. (That's right.)"

6 (Hyoheki:231) A: "Huum. Misakainaitte?! Kimi ga suki da to demo iyu no kai." without considering you ACC like COP QUOT say COM Q.

the consequences PLA

"Hmm, he doesn't care, does he? Are you saying that he has confessed to you that he loves you?"

B: "Ee, --maa." well

"Yes, it's something like that."
The semantic similarities and differences between these RPs have been not studied systematically. Therefore, this sub-thesis will focus on the analysis of the five RPs from the standpoint of semantics and socio-pragmatics. The phonological aspects of the RPs will be untouched in this paper for the reason above and will be studied separately in future work.

0.1 Previous Research

0.1.1 Japanese grammar for native speakers

In general, linguists have neglected to study this area of Japanese grammar. As we have stated above, most grammarians classify the RPs from a syntactic point of view as "ootooshi" (Response Particle) within the word-classification of exclamation or interjection, intuitively presenting statements of their meanings based on such pragmatic factors as gender, social status and age etc.

Suzuki (1972:113, 119, 503) defines the functions of hai and un as independent one-word responses, though aa is treated as a word to indicate what he calls a cry. Ee and haa are not mentioned at all. For Minami (1974:174), however, hai indicates the speaker’s agreement with, or affirmation of, the preceding proposition. Haga (1978:177) explains that hai serves as a response to the interlocutor (modus) and indicates affirmation of the proposition of the preceding sentence (dictum). Therefore hai can be observed/treated on the broader-line between the category of modus and that of dictum.

Morita: (1973:178-208) diachronically illustrates the
development of each RP and their usage in exclamation. He claims that most RPs originate from exclamations [i.e. cries or sounds] and become, diachronically, summonses, response particles and then, finally, frozen expressions. Morita (1984:228-231) also gives further descriptive and diachronic explanations in his latter work in which he focuses only on the RPs hai, haa, ee, aa, and un. He explicates the usage differences of these RPs from the pragmatic point of view but fails to extract the core meanings which underlie the diverse examples of these RPs. For example, he describes un as an affirmative response, giving some diachronic background information and then continues as follows:

\[1984:231\]

The degree of politeness of un is drastically decreased, compared with that of ee and hai, un can be used in an intimate relationship; but cannot be used in a formal situation. Hai, ee and un are ranked in terms of decreasing politeness. Un is frequently used by males in everyday conversation.

(Translation and emphasis are mine.)

Here we can observe that his statements about un are based solely on pragmatic factors i.e., the conditions on their use in context. It is the utterance meaning of these RPs, that he presents.

This sort of analysis of the RPs is very common among linguists, language teachers and textbook-writers. They do not differentiate the semantic meaning, in other words, they do not investigate RPs exhaustively to determine the core meaning of each of the RPs. Mori (1951) is the exception to the rule however. His observations on ootooshi (response particle) are distinctive. He appears to have been the first linguist to focus on the theoretical background of ootooshi, analyzing their functions in the structure of utterance/sentences from
the philosophical point of view. His approach is based on the cognitive process of each utterance (e.g. hai, haa, ee, etc.) in relation to its structure. He does not present the core meaning of each RP, since his aim is to describe the functions of ootooshi (RPs) with reference to the structure of preceding or following sentences.

0.1.2 Japanese textbooks for non-native speakers.

These phenomena which we have observed in the previous section are found commonly in Japanese language textbooks that are designed as second language textbooks for non-native speakers. Textbook discussions of RPs typically focus on socio-pragmatic factors rather than attempting to define their core meanings. They are almost always represented through translation equivalents with a statement of the meaning in another language, usually English. For instance Alfonso's textbook (1974:13) presents the following information:

Note the answer to a question. For YES, ee is used. Hai is also used, but it has a connotation of difference and is very polite; in normal situations ee is more frequent. Besides ee and hai, haa will be heard. It can be considered a variant of hai, and like hai is much used in polite conversation. At the other extreme, in very informal conversation, the grunt-like sound \( \gamma \) is quite common. (Emphasis is mine)

Alfonso, therefore, explains the significant difference between these three RPs in terms of their 'degree of formality'.

There is another textbook with the stated aim of teaching colloquial Japanese to students who have already studied grammatical items or are adept at mainly written Japanese, entitled "Basic Japanese

\( ^7 \gamma \) is equivalent to un in this paper.
- A Review Text. It is published by the University Centre for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo, (1975) and describes **un**, in more detail, as follows (1975:124).

**Un** means something like 'yeah'. It is used in speaking to one's inferior or equal but never to one's superior. There are four words in Japanese which mean "YES".

1) **Haa** "Certainly"
2) **Hai** "Yes"
3) **Ee** "Yes"
4) **Un** "Yeah" (in order of decreasing politeness)

In both these textbooks, **aa** is not treated as an RP, even though as we will show later, its behaviour is almost the same as the other RPs.

"Beginning Japanese" by E. Jorden is the only text which mentions **aa** as a response particle.

(6) Mr Tanaka: "kagi mo kakatte (i)ru?"
   key too lock
   PERF
   PLA

"Is it locked too?"

Maid: "Iie. Kakemashoo ka."
   no lock Q
   VOL
   POL

"No, shall I lock it?"
Mr Tanaka: "Aa, kakete ne?"
yes lock
GER SFP

"Yes, lock it. Will you."

She also gives English translation equivalents to **naa** (YES; that's right.), **hai** (YES; that's right. Here you are) and **ee** (YES; that's right.). She also points out that **hai** "is frequently used when handing something over to someone" (1963:29). In this Jorden shows considerable insight.

In another textbook "Modern Japanese" by Mizutani (1977:14), **hai** is given more English translation equivalents.

**Hai** is sometimes used to express agreement as is **ee**, and sometimes in the sense that 'certainly', 'with pleasure', or 'I understand' is used in English. (In showing agreement both **hai** and **ee** are used; however, **hai** is more formal.)

(Emphasis is mine)

**Un** is given the following explanation (p. 150):

**un = ee** (familiar, used mainly by men.)

(Emphasis is mine)

**Mizutani** suggests that **hai** has a wider range of use than that of **ee**. He differentiates between the RPs on the basis of their varying degrees of formality.

All the textbooks tell the students what to do but they do not explain why. It is inevitable that the explanation in the textbooks is limited and should not be filled with technical terms. In general their explanation is purely pragmatic being based solely on translation.

---

equivalents. If the students have to memorize all the equivalent "meanings", they are simply required to expend more effort and rely on the translation equivalents and would never understand the language as a whole which is used by the community. Therefore, a core meaning underlying all the diverse uses of each RP must be recognized by textbook writers and language instructors and should be presented to the students in class, if students are to gain any competence in their ability to respond to questions in the manner of a native speaker.

The foundation of these RPs is extremely important in any speech situation, since they exist to convey the speaker’s reaction or attitude to the addressee.

0.1.3 Recent Research

In the framework of recent linguistic theory there are two papers about hai and ee; one by Kitagawa (1977) and the other by Hinata (1980). Both linguists aim to apply their analyses to Japanese language as it is taught to non-native speakers. This causes problems because textbooks treat haa, hai, ee, aa and un as all meaning "yes", their usage being differentiated only in terms of decreasing politeness. Non-native speakers, unfamiliar with the Japanese system of social ranking, may find it impossible to attain the native-speaker’s competence in the use of these RPs.

Kitagawa’s and Hinata’s papers are very intriguing, Kitagawa’s account being perhaps the first attempt to explicate the meanings of hai and ee. The analytical approaches they adopt towards these RPs are different: Kitagawa intends to present the core principle behind the
divers uses of *hai* and *ee*, while Hinata analyses *hai* and *ee* from the point of view of their functions. However, both Hinata’s and Kitagawa’s analyses are in some ways problematic. Firstly, neither has investigated these RPs exhaustively. For example, they both deal with *hai* and *ee* on sentence-initial position, but do not refer to the other positions *hai* and *ee* can occupy, such as sentence-internal or sentence-final. Secondly, although they mention the other RPs *un* and *haa*, they do not discuss them in any depth. Below, we discuss the approaches and assess the shortcomings of each linguist in detail.

**Kitagawa**

Kitagawa’s aim is to determine the difference in meaning between *hai* and *ee*, by excluding from *hai* the sense of affirmation or approval which is always presented as the meaning of *hai* by other linguists. (e.g. Haga 1978, Morita 1984). His approach is laudable but he fails to present clear-cut definitions of *hai* and *ee*. Kitagawa’s definitions of *hai* and *ee* are given below:

1. *Hai* wa aite no ittakoto to, mata tsutaen to suru koto ga, kochirani hakkiri todoita to iyu koto o kei o motte hyojisuru tame no oosei de aru.\(^9\) (Emphasis is mine.)

   *Hai* is a response that indicates respectfully that the speaker (the person who said *hai*) has clearly perceived what his interlocutor has said (or has intended to convey).

   (My translation.)

2. *Ee* wa aite no itta koto ni taishite no jibun no kimochi o hyooshutsusuru koe de atte, *kakoo no intoneeshon de hakkiri iikiru* baai wa “jibun mo sono yooni omou” to iyu kimochi o hyooshutsusuru koto ni naru.

\(^9\) O. Mizutani & N. Mizutani, “nihongo notes 2” 1979: 68
Ee indicates the speaker's attitude (the same as above), toward what his/her interlocutor has said. When ee is say positively with falling intonation, it indicates that the speaker thinks in the same way as the interlocutor does. (Emphasis and translation are mine.)

However hai can also be used in speaking to an animal or baby, as the following examples show.

Rider to a horse:

(7) "Hai doo doo."

"OK giddy-up"

Speaker to a baby:

(8) "Hai miruku o nonde."

yes milk OBJ drink GER

"Come on, have some milk."

Thus, Kitagawa bases his definitions of the differences between the meaning of hai and ee on the diverse uses of hai and ee. However, some problems can be seen in his paraphrases of each item. Firstly, he explicates hai with a pragmatic factor, keii o motte (respectfully), although as we have just seen hai can be used in addressing a horse or a baby, things that normally engender affection but not necessarily respect. It can be shown therefore that respect is not a common factor in all the uses of hai. Secondly, Kitagawa's paraphrase of hai can be misinterpreted by readers, since the underlying meaning of hai is that it should indicate not only the speaker's attitude in answer to the
addressee's expectation but also that the speaker has perceived that which the addressee communicates. *Hai* also is used where a pre-emption of the addressee's requirement has occurred. Kitagawa discusses this aspect but neglects to incorporate it in his core paraphrase of *hai*. Consequently, Hinata, like Kitagawa provides an insufficient interpretation of *hai*. Neither linguist therefore fully expounds the pre-emption factor.

According to Hinata, *hai* conveys a forward looking attitude of the speaker to a stimulus. He then divides *hai* into two categories; one is that of the summons and the other is that of the response to a stimulus. However he does not correctly interpret the content of Kitagawa's paper. Kitagawa emphasizes the speaker's anticipatory attitude in answer to the addressee's expectation, which is a most passive role, being neither a summons nor a response in any direct sense.

Thirdly, Kitagawa explains only *hai* and *ee* and whilst his definitions of these are accurate, his definition of *ee* is also equally applicable to *aa*.

Fourthly, although Kitagawa mentions the effect intonation has on the meaning conveyed by both *ee* and *hai*, intonation is an independent facet of language, with fixed meanings associated with particular intonation types.

Finally, although Kitagawa and Hinata accurately define *hai* as a "recognition response", and *ee* as an "agreement response", Kitagawa's understanding of the basic meaning of both *hai* and *ee* is ambiguous since his definition of the core paraphrases is far too broad and abstract. Definitions require simple, concrete and intelligible language if they are
to be understood by non-native speakers with no background of Japanese social and linguistic information. The native speaker can also be confused by the absence of a clear presentation of core meanings. This area of research, almost entirely unrepresented in past studies, constitutes a fundamental aspect of this work.

Hinata

Hinata's analysis of hai and ee is based on the situational approach. Accordingly he considers the RPs within a minimum discourse unit. Whilst the context in a discourse is important, it is not the only influential factor to be considered. Hinata investigates hai and ee as responses in relation to types of preceding sentence, i.e., command/request - response; declarative-response; interrogative-response, exclamation-response. On this basis he presents the meanings of hai and ee's functions but he fails to explicate their individual core meanings. Moreover he does not semantically differentiate un from the other two particles. See his example below Hinata: 1980:224.

(9) A: "Sooji wa owarimashita ka?"
   cleaning TOP finish Q POL

   "Have you finished cleaning the room?"

B: "Hai/ee/un."
   (Cited from Hinata's example, 1980:224)

Hinata describes hai, ee and un as affirmative responses only, which as we have already noted is not always the case. Furthermore, Hinata distinguishes between hai, ee and un solely on the basis of their
degree of politeness in a given situation. This does nothing to facilitate an understanding of the core meaning of these expressions.

0.2. Methodology

We have already shown how all previous descriptions of these response particles fail to distinguish between their semantic and socio-pragmatic components. These response particles need to be addressed on two levels; on the one hand we want to analyse the socio-pragmatic components that influence the choice of these RPs in a specific situation, and on the other hand we want to explicate their lexical semantic components (i.e., the core meaning), for it is the latter particularly that have been ignored in previous work on Japanese response particles. The reader should be cautioned that the relationship between semantics and pragmatics is a controversial matter and can be defined in various ways. It is viewed differently by different scholars such as Gazdar 1979, Cole 1981, Levinson 1983, Leech 1983 and Wierzbicka in press. The distinction between lexical semantic and socio-pragmatic components observed here is not equivalent to the distinction between semantics and pragmatics on defined, for example, in Gazdar (1979)¹⁰. Leech (1983:6) presents three different views of the relationship between semantics and pragmatics as "Semanticism", "Complementarism" and "Pragmaticism" in the three diagrams.

¹⁰ G. Gazdar (1979a:2) "Pragmatics has as its topic those aspects of the meaning of utterances which cannot be accounted for by straightforward reference to the truth conditions of the sentences uttered. Put crudely: PRAGMATICS = MEANING - TRUTH CONDITIONS."
and states that "Pragmatics is distinguished from semantics in being concerned with meaning in relation to a speech situation. (1983:6)". Wierzbicka (in press) discusses Leech's three views and adds a fourth view such as follows:

She redefines pragmatics: "there is a linguistic pragmatics, which can form a part of a coherent, integrated description of linguistic competence, and there is another pragmatics, or other pragmatics (in the plural): a domain or domains of the sociologist, the psychologist, the ethnomethodologist, the literary scholars, and so on. ... There is no gulf between linguistic pragmatics and linguistic semantics; on the contrary, linguistic pragmatics can be fruitfully seen as part of linguistic semantics. But there is a gulf between linguistic pragmatics and various other, heterogeneous, considerations of language use." Thus, she distinguishes linguistic pragmatics ( = linguistic semantics ) from non-linguistic pragmatics. The latter corresponds to Leech's term of "socio-pragmatics" (1983). This is the point of the definition between the semantics and pragmatics, although this is not the only definition between them. Both Leech and Wierzbicka are aware of culture-specific

11 G.N. Leech (1983:6) Fig.1.1.
elements in natural language and emphasize that we should approach meaning from a point of view which combines semantics and pragmatics. Therefore we shall adopt Leech's term of "socio-pragmatics"\textsuperscript{12} and Wierzbicka's distinction between semantics (including linguistic pragmatics) and non-linguistic pragmatics in this study, since Japanese language is used in a socially and psychologically culture-specific community. Semantics and much of the content of linguistic pragmatics, for instance illocutionary force, is applied in the definition for the core meaning of RPs that we provide in chapters 2 and 3. The relevance of the distinction between semantics and non-linguistic pragmatics is fundamental to this study and both influences will be treated separately in Chapter 4 in which the socio-pragmatic factors have to do rather with variation in speech situation introduced by relative social status, interpersonal relation, etc.

Our analysis deals with semantics first in contrast to the approach of most linguists (including language teachers and text writers) who present these RPs from a situational point of view. They typically differentiate between the RPs in terms of degrees of politeness. It is our intention here to argue that each RP has its own invariant lexical meaning. Given the multifaceted nature of the many forces effecting the choice of RPs how can we expect to do this? It is our belief that the Wierzbicka illocutionary semantic approach provides the necessary analytical means by which the core meaning of each RP can

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{12} G.N. Leech (1983:10-11) "... socio-pragmatics is the sociological interface of pragmatics. Much of the work which has taken place in conversational analysis has been limited in this sense, and has been closely bound to local conversation data. The term PRAGMALINGUISTICS, on the other hand, can be applied to the study of the more linguistic end of pragmatics - where we consider the particular resources which a given language provides for conveying particular illocutions."}
be explicated. This method of reductive paraphrase will be used here because:

"Any serious description of a language as an instrument of human interaction must provide some insight into the meaning of particles. Descriptive labels do not provide any real insight. If the linguist describing a language wants tenable his addressee to "feel" the force of a particle, to understand the unifying principle behind its apparently diverse uses, to comprehend the logic which control the native speaker's use of it, he must experiment with different possible paraphrases until he hits upon one which would fit all the types of contexts in which this particle has been observed to appear." (Wierzbicka 1976:332-333)

At the end of this study the whole meaning of each response particle will be defined in terms of its semantic - socio-pragmatic components.

1.1 The definition of Speaker-Orientedness and Addressee-Orientedness.

The five RPs hai, haa, ee, aa and un are uttered by a speaker in response to some stimulus. They can usefully be divided into two groups: those that are directed towards the addressee and those which are directed only towards the speaker himself. This is illustrated in the following table.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Stimulus} & \text{---} & \text{Speaker} \\
\text{Addressee} & \text{----} & \text{stimulus} \\
\text{-----} & \text{response} \\
\end{array}
\]

In Figure 1, in response to the stimulus, the speaker's utterance is directed towards and intended for only himself.

In Figure 2, in response to the stimulus, the speaker's utterance is directed towards and intended for the addressee.
Speaker oriented RPs (Table 1) are used when the speaker’s utterance is directed towards the speaker himself. It typically expresses spontaneous feelings or clarifies the inner thoughts of the speaker. Such self-talk disregards the presence of an addressee, so there is no interaction between them, by definition all speaker oriented utterances must be in the plain speech style, devoid of any honorifics. Here aa and un are classified as being speaker oriented. Here it should be made clear that speaker oriented RPs are not restricted to monologue situations. Rather, even in situation where an addressee is present, the main force of the speaker-oriented RPs is directed toward the speaker.

Addressee oriented RPs, on the other hand, are inappropriate in monologue situation or inner speech. Addressee oriented RPs are used when the speaker interacts with an addressee in response to some stimulus, demonstrating his/her attitude or judgement of the proposition which arises from the stimulus as the utterance is directed towards a person other than the speaker, addressee orientedness requires the polite style (Bunkacho, 1971:101-102). Here hai, haa and ee are classified as being addressee oriented.

2.1 Speaker-Orientedness

As we use it here the concept of speaker-oriented describes utterances intended for the speaker’s ears only, excluding the addressee, whose presence is not relevant. Speaker interaction can be illustrated as follows:

Stimulus ----> Speaker

(Figure 1. in chapter 1.)
The speaker perceives the stimulus [from outside of his mind], and reacts to it without addressing his interlocutor. This is self-talk. There are two levels of self-talk one is purely monological and the other dialogical. In purely monological self-talk the speaker immediately reacts to the stimulus as soon as he perceives it. This is spontaneous reaction. Therefore the existence of the addressee is not totally involved. Spontaneous exclamatory utterances arise in purely monological self-talk. On the other hand, in dialogical self-talk, the speaker casts himself into two roles, the speaker and the addressee, through posing questions to himself in both roles, the speaker and the addressee. Through posing some questions to himself he clarifies his inner thought and encodes it into the utterance. Thus, the existence of an addressee is not essential since the speaker interacts only with himself. Aa and un are speaker-oriented since both of them occur in self-talk, and are not directed towards an addressee. [Although aa and un are independent one-word utterances.] They tend to co-occur with a preceding sentence which is in the plain style, since the polite style is restricted to addressee oriented speech. For detailed discussion of the way in which the polite speech style can be shown to be oriented towards the addressee see Bunkacho (1972:36).

Let us examine aa and un respectively.

2.2 Aa

Aa is speaker-oriented: it can be used in a pure monologue, and indicates the speaker's sudden realization resulting from an encounter
between his feelings or, some stimulus and the thought which it has invoked. The speaker is not interested in the existence of the addressee and the lack of his interest, concern and commitment to the addressee can be conveyed by saying *aa*. Consequently, *aa* precedes sentences, such as spontaneous exclamations, which convey the result of the encounter between the stimulus and the speaker and expresses his feelings or desires. The following examples, where *aa* is uttered spontaneously, zero-point in the dexies, category demonstrates this point.

Example: spontaneous exclamation

Situation: The speaker has looked out of the window and sees it is snowing.

(1) a: "**Aa** yuki"
   snow
* b: Un
* c: Hai
* d: Haa
* e: Ee

   "It is snowing!"

Situation: The speaker has just tasted something such as food, a cigarette or whatever and suddenly experiences its taste.

(2) a: "**Aa** oishii."
   delicious
* b: Un
* c: Hai
* d: Haa
* e: Ee

   "It is delicious!"
Situation: The speaker loves coffee very much but has not drunk it for weeks and suddenly the smell of it which reminds him of his liking for the beverage.

(3) a: "Aa kooohii ga nomitai."
   coffee ACC drink DES PLA


"I am dying for coffee!"

Compare (3) with the following sentence;

(4) "Kooohii ga nomitai na."
   coffee ACC drink SFP DES
   "I want to drink coffee."

The speaker has been thinking of his desire (to drink coffee) for a while and his inner thought has just been vocalized.

Situation: The speaker has accidentally found an old photo which stimulates nostalgic memories, promoting the utterance of aa.

(5) a: "Aa soo datta."
   so COP PLA

*b: Un  *c: Hai  *d: Haa  *e: Ee

"Yes, I remember that."
Aa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stimulus</th>
<th>speaker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>snow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foo</td>
<td>aa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell of coffee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an old photo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.

The above examples of aa have a core meaning which can be represented as follows:

I say this to myself because I want to say what I feel/think about what is happening in my mind.

"I say this to myself" indicates self-talk. Therefore hai/haa/ee are impossible in these examples, and "because I want to say what I feel about "what is happening in my mind" indicates the spontaneity of the speaker's feelings in examples (1) and (2). "Because I want to say what I think about what is happening in my mind" expresses the speaker's self-awareness in example (5). Although un is speaker oriented, it is not acceptable in these examples. The reason is that un implies the speaker's inner consultation (see in 2.2).

2.3 Un

Un is also speaker-oriented, since it occurs in self-talk. There is a dialogical characteristic in self-talk in which un occurs. In the process of the encoding of the speaker's inner thoughts, he plays two roles, one is as a questioner and the other is as an answerer, in order to
clarify his knowledge or experience\textsuperscript{13}. For example:

Situation: The speaker goes to a restaurant which a friend has recommended as specializing in a particular dish, though she has doubts about her friend’s advice. As she tastes the food she is asking herself “kore wa oishii to kitto kedo oishii ka na?” (I’ve heard that this is delicious but I wonder if it really is?). Example (6), her utterance upon tasting the food is in fact a response to this non-verbalised self-posed question.

Self-conviction statement.

(6) “\un kore wa oishii.”
   this TOP delicious
   “Indeed this is delicious.”

(7) “\un kore wa yuki da.”
   this TOP snow COP
   PLA
   “It will be snowing soon.”

In example (7), the speaker has prior knowledge from the weather forecast that it will probably snow, when he feels the temperature dropping he recognizes that it is true.

Thus the same mental process leading to \un being said, is apparent in both examples (6) and (7). The speaker utters \un as a response to the realization that a thought or idea about which he had previously entertained doubts is in fact the truth.

\un indicates the speaker’s recognition of these thoughts. Therefore, \un frequently occurs with volitional or assertive sentences in

\textsuperscript{13} R. Jakobson & JU, Tynjanov (198:10) “The inverted answer and question game is typical of inner speech, where the subject knows beforehand the reply to the question he will put to himself.”
self talk and where the speaker having thought for sometime wishes to conclude the thought process and make a statement of decision.

Volition

Situation: A politician has been thinking of putting himself forward as a candidate for the up-coming general election, when he finally comes to a decision, he convinces himself by saying un.

(8) "Un yaru zo."
   do SFP
   PLA

   "O.K. I'll do it!"

Alternatively, if his decision had been to not stand he would have said:

(9) "Un yameyoo"
    quit PLA
    HOR

    "Right, I don't do it!"

The speaker has been thinking of something in her/his mind and determines to take some action by saying un. Un can be replaced by a word yoshi (I am sold on that idea).

(10) "Yoshi yaru zo."

Assertion: The speaker convinces himself of his assertion.

Situation: The speaker is watching a tennis game between Connors and Lendl on TV. He is a fan of Connors. Even though he is losing the game, he still wants to believe he will win. He will say the following.
The use of un here is the speaker's device of bolstering his confidence that his faith, in Connors ability to win, is not misplaced. The core meaning of un can be represented in the following paraphrase.

I want to cause myself to be sure that what I have been thinking is true.

"I want to cause myself to be sure" indicates self-talk, and it spells out the speaker's firm conviction in the examples from (6) to (10). In other words, un in contrast with aa involves some illocutionary force. "What I have been thinking" spells out the speaker's inner consultation and "What I have been thinking is true" expresses the conclusion of the speaker's inner consultation, as can be seen in all the above examples from (6) to (10).

Aa is used in a purely monological situation, while un is used in a dialogical situation. Compare these previous examples.

(12) "Aa kore wa oishii."
    "This is delicious!"

(13) "Aa kyoo wa yuki da."
    "It will snow today!"

(14) "Un kore wa oishii."
    "This is delicious."
(15) "Un kyoo wa yuki da."
"It will snow today."

(12) and (13) are spontaneous exclamations, while (14) and (15) are statements. The utterance aa indicates that the starting point of the speaker's mental activities, as caused by the stimulus, is contemporaneous with his response. It is a non-intentional utterance. Therefore aa indicates the speaker's sudden realization. On the other hand, un is the speaker's recognition of the proposition. The following expressions of desire, intention or will arise after the process of clarification of the speaker's inner thoughts is recognized by saying un. Un implies that mental activity has been in progress prior to un being uttered. His mental activity is verbalized and he clearly knows what he really thinks. The speaker intentionally utters un in self-talk in order to convince himself, of the decision he has reached.

3.1 Addressee-Orientedness

Addressee-oriented utterances are formulated and initiated by the speaker toward an addressee, so the existence of the addressee is essential. In Japanese, speech oriented towards another person normally requires the polite speech style. The interaction between the speaker and the addressee is "mutual involvement" in Lyons term (Lyons 1977: 34).

Addressee-orientedness was illustrated in Figure 2 in Chapter 1. This figure is reproduced here for the convenience of the reader.
The arrows show that the speaker perceives the stimuli which are the verbal or non-verbal utterances of the addressee and responds to the addressee. This process incorporates the discourse into the mode of social interaction. So, socio-pragmatic factors have an affect in addressee-oriented utterances, since the relationship between the speaker and the addressee is of primary concern. However, the purpose of this chapter is to attempt to find out the core meanings of the RPs (hai, haa and ee). The core meanings, together with socio-pragmatic factors, will be examined in the following chapter in order to present the entire meaning of each RP.

The component sense of addressee-oriented utterances can be given as follows:

I want to say something to you because I know that you want me to say something to you

The three RPs (hai, haa and ee) are addressee-oriented. There is some observable overlap in their usage, but this is because their usage is context-dependent.

In the following section, the core meaning of each RP will be examined in turn.
3.2 **Hai**

*Hai* is addressee-oriented: it is used in a dialogue and directed toward the addressee in order to convey the speaker's temporary understanding of the situation with the addressee. There are two different kinds of interaction: (i) where the stimulus (the very existence of the addressee) prompts the speaker to respond to the addressee and (ii) where the stimulus (utterance of the addressee), prompts the speaker to respond to the addressee's utterance. The following figures illustrate this:

(i) 
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Addressee's expectation non-verbal)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

(ii) 
```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Addressee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stimuli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Addressee's verbal utterance)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

---

We propose that *hai* indicates the speaker's acknowledgement that he is expected by the addressee to say or do something in the situation they both share.

Let us examine the applicability of the above interpretation of *hai* in the environments in which it typically occurs. *Hai* occurs at sentence-initial, internal and final position in the interaction between the speaker and the addressee who sub-consciously or consciously share
the same situation. This is where the use of *hai* corresponds to the English discourse particle "well" as discussed by Halliday & Hasan (1976:269), R. Lakoff (1973:453-467), Schorup (1985:64-94) and Wierzbicka (1976:355-366).

Kitagawa (1977) defines the meaning of *hai* as follows:

*Hai* is a reactive utterance in order to indicate respectfully that the speaker (the person who said *hai*) has clearly perceived what his interlocutor has said or has intended to convey.

(Translation and emphasis are mine.)

In Kitagawa, the speaker's attitude is presented as a passive one, the speaker expects his utterance to have an immediate effect upon the addressee, so *hai* is assumed to have here not only illocutionary force but also perlocutionary force (in Austin's sense). Kitagawa examines and discusses *hai* at sentence-initial position only. However, to provide the core meaning of *hai*, it is necessary to examine the full range of its diverse uses. *Hai* also occurs at sentence-internal and sentence-final positions, occurrences which a thorough analysis of these RPs must take into consideration. Therefore we shall now examine these alternative positions.

The following section examines sentence-initial *hai*.

### 3.2.1 Sentence-initial - *hai*

Whatever occurs prior to the utterance of *hai* pre-exists and is shared by both the speaker and the addressee, or by the addressee alone. By saying *hai*, the speaker establishes a break between what precedes and what follows, and shifts the onus of response to the speaker's side, by drawing attention, with the utterance of *hai*, to whatever follows.
Hai cannot exist in isolation from whatever follows, except where it constitutes a YES/NO answer to a question.

Hinata (1980) argues against Kitagawa's definition of sentence-initial hai, (1977:66) treating it as a particle of address (not a response particle) which has the function of opening a discourse, because one of the uses of hai at sentence-initial position involves a context where it does not follow any other utterance. Hinata is wrong in this, for the following reason: Kitagawa defines the occurrence of hai in sentence-initial position as conditioned or restricted by the requirement that the situation be shared by both speakers and addressee. For example, hai cannot be used to address somebody who is a total stranger, because the stranger is not sharing anything with the speaker (see example (3) below). Here Kitagawa's examples are cited (rewritten for the reader's convenience).

Situation: A person (A) is buying a train ticket from a station clerk (B)

(1) A: "Shinbashī ichimai."
    one-ticket
    "One ticket to Shinbashī, please."

    B: "...Hai, rokujuuen no otsuri
    60 yen    change
    "Here it is, 60 yen change."

Situation: A female colleague (A) is giving a birthday present to her male colleague (B)

(2) A: "Hai kore"
    this
"Here you are this is for you."

B: "Nandai. Kirei na nekutai ja nai ka."
    What nice necktie not Q

"What is this? It is a nice necktie, isn't it?"

Situation: A thief (A) is asking a passerby to keep something for him.

(3) A: "Hai sumimasenga, owareteiru n desu. Excuse me. pursue COM COP
    pursue PASS POL
    pursue PLA
    Kore chotto azukatte okunnassai." this for a while keep (request)
    keep PER
    keep HON
    keep POL

"Excuse me, I am being pursued. Will you keep this for a while?"

Here, in example (3), hai cannot be used as a particle of address, because the thief and passerby are total strangers; i.e. have nothing in common. Hai is always a response and accompanies the speaker's reaction to the addressee, wherever its position is.

Compare the following examples:

Situation: The addressee has asked the speaker (the person who says hai) to make a cup of tea. The speaker has made the cup of tea and gives it to the addressee, saying:

(4) "Hai ocha"
    "Here it is."
"Oi" is a particle of address which draws the addressee's attention. Therefore, the functions of hai and "oi" are totally different. Hai is accompanied by the speaker's action, while "oi" serves to indicate the addressee's request for a cup of tea. By saying "oi" the speaker makes the addressee make a cup of tea for him. The speaker responds to the expectation of the addressee by saying hai. Both the speaker and the addressee share the same understanding of the situation. Accordingly hai indicates cooperation and "oi" indicates a request for cooperation. Therefore hai cannot be treated as a discourse opening particle, even in cases where there is nothing overt preceding it. In this instance even a sentence-final-hai:

(6) "Ocha hai." 
    "Here is the tea." does not alter the function and meaning of hai. See below (3.2.3) for a further discussion of sentence-final-hai.

The following example will serve to further illustrate this point, with regard to sentence-final-hai:

Situation: Radio DJs often begin their programmes by saying hai together with some additional greeting.

(7) DJ: "Hai konbanwa." 
    "Hello and good evening."
Here the DJ is responding to his listener's subconscious expectations by first saying *hai* then preferring a greeting. *Hai* establishes a break between what precedes and what follows. Here, by saying *hai* first, the DJ draws his listener's attention and makes them get ready for his next utterance. *Hai* also frequently occurs at the sentence-initial position in the following types of utterances.

- *Hai* + REQUEST
- *Hai* + COMMAND
- *Hai* + SUGGESTION

In these environments *hai* serves the same function as described above: it shows the speaker's acknowledgement and recognition of the situation. The speaker brings an end to the addressee's previous mental or physical activities and focuses his attention on the following utterance.

*Hai* is also found initially before interrogative sentences, wh-questions and polar questions.

Situation: A teacher (A) having previously described several countries in Asia, is pointing to places on the map and asking pupils which country it is.

(8) A: "*Hai* kore wa doko no kuni desuka?"  
this TOP which GEN country COP Q  
POL

"Well, which country is this?"
In explaining examples of the following type textbook writers, language teachers and lexicographers suggest that the meaning of hai is affirmation. However, we suggest that hai precedes an answer to a YES/NO question, but does not have the sense of affirmation as an inherent component.

Situation: A teacher asking a pupil whether it is Indonesia on the map.

(9) A: “Hai, koko wa Indonesia desu ka?”
       here TOP Indonesia COP Q
       “Right. Is this Indonesia?”
       POL

B: “Hai.”

“Yes, it is.”

Here hai is commonly treated as an affirmation, but since hai has no affirmative meaning in and of itself, this sense only applies in a conditioned situation, such as a response to a YES/NO question in which a questioner is seeking information from a respondent about whether it is Indonesia or whether it is not Indonesia.

If the respondent shows his recognition of the question by saying hai as in example (9) the answer can be interpreted as an affirmative in this context. If, however, the respondent does not add a following sentence hai can only be interpreted as meaning that the speaker does not have any objection to the proposition. Hai therefore automatically assumes an affirmative role. In example (9) if a negative response
follows *hai*, then *hai* serves only to indicate the respondent's recognition of the question. *Hai* indicates the speaker's recognition of the question, and after *hai*, the respondent provides the requested information to the questioner.

We have shown then that the sense of affirmation is not an inherent component of *hai*, although certain environments can trigger its use in this way. Therefore while *hai* can precede a response to a wh-question, which seeks new information, *hai* alone cannot possibly serve as an affirmative, since wh-questions do not require either affirmation or denial.

Consider the following example:

(10) A: "Kore wa dare no booshi desu ka?"
   this TOP who GEN cap COP Q POL
   "Whose cap is this?"

B: "Hai. Watashi no desu."
   I GEN COP POL
   "Here! It's mine."

Here, *hai* simply indicates the speaker's recognition of the question. After *hai*, the speaker provides the answer to the question.

The meaning of sentence-initial *hai* can be represented in the following paraphrase:

I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure I am expected to say something to you or do something for you.
"I want to say this to you" indicates that the item is addressee-oriented. "Because I want you to know" spells out the speaker's intention to interact with the addressee. "I am sure that I am expected to say something to you" or do something for you" indicates that the speaker's conviction is based on his anticipation of the addressee's expectation. "Do something for you" indicates that the speaker simultaneously takes some action by saying hai.

3.2.2 Sentence-internal - hai

Consider the following examples:

Situation: A delivery boy brings food to the house, and hands it over to the person who has ordered it, simultaneously saying hai.

(11) "Omachidoosama, hai omachidoosamadeshita."
"I'm sorry to have kept you waiting. Here it is."

Situation: A person is trying to remember the date.

(12) "Kyoo wa .... hai, 7 gatsu 25 nichi desu ne."
"Today is .... the 25th of July, I am sure."

In such contexts as these, hai also establishes a break between what precedes and what follows. By saying hai, the speaker shifts the preceding uncertain state into the concrete state, hai therefore brings the incomplete state to completion. In example (11) above hai is uttered while handing the food to the customer, and the past tense of "Omachidoosama deshita" indicates the completion of the action. In
sentence (12) the speaker is not initially sure of the date, but remembers it after some inner consultation. He signals his recognition of the date by saying hai.

In the internal position, hai signals a break in conversation but at the same time strongly implies that the speaker intends to complete his utterance. The meaning of hai here can be represented by the following paraphrase:

I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure that I am going to say more after this.

"I want to say this to you" indicates that the RP is addressee-oriented and "because I want you to know" spells out that the speaker intends to interact with the addressee. "I am sure that I am going to say more after this" spells out the speaker's conviction about the forward reference (i.e., in Halliday and Hasan's sense (1976:269), "what follows is in fact a response to what has preceded") of his utterance.

14 cf. M.A.K. Halliday & R. Hasan (1976:269) "If tonic, it means 'I acknowledge the question, and will give a considered answer', often therefore amounting to no more than a hesitation noise: 'I'm thinking about it'. ... well serves to indicate that what follows is in fact a response to what has preceded: in other words, it slips in quietly the respondent's claim to be answering the question (sometimes with a show of reluctance) and hence is purely cohesive in function. cf. A. Wierzbicka (1976:357) "Well" as an English particle.
3.2.3 Sentence-final - hai

Consider the following examples:

Situation: A is giving B directions on the phone to get to a given point.

(13) A: "Menomaeni gakkoo ga arimasu. Sono right in front of school NOM exist its POL
seimon mae desu." maingate in front of COP POL

"When you reach that point you will see a school right in front of you. The place you want is just in front of its main gate."

B: "A soo desu ka Anoo hai." so COP Q well POL

"Ah is that so. Well ... right."

"Doomo arigatoo gozaimashita." "Thank you very much."

(Rokuonki: 283)

Here, hai serves to indicate either the conclusion of the process of the speaker's inner consultation or the decision to end his preceding utterance. Hai establishes a break between what precedes and what follows and leads the addressee to focus on the following utterance. In this context hai again serves the speaker's purpose well.

The following example illustrates the above point.

Situation: The speaker is describing his future plans to his interlocutor.
(14) B: "Rainen Amerika ni iku tsumoridesu, hai"
next year USA LOC go intend
"I am going to the USA next year, (right)."

Hai, at the end of the speaker's utterance, confirms what he has said by establishing a break and drawing the addressee's attention to the forward referring utterance. The addressee feels awkwardness or tension following the space after hai. Since the forward referring utterance is not continued by the speaker. This is the natural result of the forward referring feature of hai.

The following is a further example of the phenomena of hai occurring both sentence-initially and finally.

Example (3) in Introduction.
"Hai onna no minoue de arimasu kara
woman GEN circumstance INS be since
ne hai."
SFP
"I am just a poor, weak woman"

Are there any differences between the use of the initial hai and that of the final hai? No. Both simply serve to establish a break, by which the speaker is drawing attention from the addressee and leads the addressee to focus on his statement. After the final hai, there is some tension because the speaker remains silent, while the addressee (= the next speaker) knows that he is expected to say or do something for the speaker. Wherever hai occurs it does so as a prompt by which the speaker obtains the desired or favourable response from the addressee.
Consider the following examples.

(15) "Ame ga furimasu, hai."

rain NOM rain

"It will rain, sure."

(16) "Watashi wa ikimasu, hai."

I TOP go

"I will go, for sure."

Hai denotes the expectation of a favourable response, though it is used only when favourable acceptance by the addressee can be reasonably assumed. In (15) and (16) the statements immediately preceding hai should be favourably viewed by the addressee, since the addressee's subconscious or conscious expectation can be read by the speaker. In (16) the speaker at least believes that the addressee expects (or agrees) that the speaker intends to go. Therefore the speaker adds hai in order to establish a break and by doing so, to highlight his intention to the addressee.

If these preceding statements which convey the speaker's will/decision, cannot be assumed to be favourable to the addressee, hai cannot occur here. Instead, un would be more appropriate since it can be used when the speaker ignores the expectation of the addressee. For instance (15) would only be acceptable in the context of the situation where it has not rained for ages, and people desperately pray for rain. Then (15) becomes acceptable, because the statement answers the
addressee's expectation.

The meaning of sentence-final-hai can be represented in the following paraphrase:

I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure of what I have said to you.

"I want to say this to you" indicates addressee-orientation, "because I want you to know" spells out the speakers intentions to interact with the addressee. "That I am sure of what I have said to you" spells out the speaker's conviction of his own proposition toward the addressee.

3.2.4 Conclusion

We shall now present the formulae of hai as it occurs in each position.

Sentence-initial-hai.
I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure that I am expected to say something to you or I do something for you.

Sentence-internal-hai.
I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure that I am going to say more after this.

Sentence-final-hai.
I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am sure of what I have said to you.
The above formulae show that the meaning of *hai* in any position in the sentence is essentially the same involving the sense of establishing a break and drawing attention to what follows. *Hai* confirms that in the view of the speaker and the addressee share the same world.

In the case of sentence-initial-*hai*, the speaker responds to the addressee's preceding verbalized desire or unexpressed expectation.

Basically we agree with Hinata's definition of the function of *hai* as developing discussion since it encourages the interaction between the speaker and the addressee, but we disagree with his claim that *hai* functions to open a discourse. In our view, sentence-initial-*hai* is conditional on the requirement of shared interpretation in the speech situation.

This suggests that Kitagawa's interpretation of *hai* is insufficient, since *hai* does not just mean that the speaker has clearly perceived what his interlocutor has said or has intended to convey.

In the case of sentence-internal-*hai*, the speaker establishes a break by saying *hai*. When the speaker comes to his conclusion of his inner consultation, he intends to show that stage to the addressee. *Hai* draws the addressee's attention from the preceding utterance to the following utterance. With the sentence-final-*hai*, the speaker establishes a break after his utterance and confirms his proposition directed toward the addressee.

All of this discussion supports our proposal about the core meaning of *hai*. 
3.3 Haa

Haa is addressee-oriented and represents a reserved judgement. The speaker uses haa as a time-stalling strategy and thus haa denotes a form of evasiveness in the speaker-addressee interaction. Haa implies that the speaker intends to convey the "zero-point temporal state" of his mind. He is in the process of inner consultation in response to immediate impressions.

![Figure 5](image)

Haa is always the speaker's response to some verbal stimulus from the addressee. The speaker has not fully understood what he has perceived in the context of a discourse, for example:

(17) A: "Kimi wa rakkyo no kawa o shitteiru ne?"
    "You know the skin of cocktail onion, don't you?"

B: "Haa rakkyo no kawa desu ka?"
    "Well ... are you talking about the skin of cocktail onion?"

(Hino michi: 107)

\[15\] See J. Lyons (1977:684) for the definition regarding the use of "zero-point temporal state".
The speaker who says *haa* knows what the skin of a cocktail onion is, but does not understand why A has mentioned it. Therefore, *haa* here implies that the speaker is thinking of the preceding utterance and does not fully understand it yet. So by the following sentence, which is an interrogative sentence, the speaker is confirming what he has heard. He did not have any anticipation of what his interlocutor was going to say.

Consider the following example:

(18) "Haaruhodo."
"Ah, indeed."

*Haa* implies that the speaker is in the process of inner consultation and trying to digest the preceding utterance. When he says "naruhodo (Indeed, I see)\(^{1}\)", his inner consultation is over. *Haa* usually occurs sentence-initially, since the speaker intends to signal to the addressee that he is still in the process of inner consultation. However, it also occurs at the sentence-internal or at the sentence-final positions. If the speaker intends to think further, or needs to do so, he will say *haa*. Thus *haa* is used in response to the following sentence types.

1) Declarative + *ne*/*na*

Interrogative

Suggestion

These sentence types oblige the addressee to respond. If the speaker says *haa* in a context in which it can be assumed that he fully
understands what he has heard this is indicative of his use of a conversational strategy intended to maintain face.

2) Command

*Haa* is inappropriate as a response to a command, because commands demand obedience, and cannot be responded to evasively. (cf. example of *hai* in chapter 4:100).

These elements of *haa* can be summarized in the following paraphrase:

*I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I am not sure what you want me to do or say; I am thinking of what you have said to me.*

"I want to say this to you" indicates that the speaker responds to the addressee "because I want you to know that I am not sure what you want me to do or say" spells out the speaker's evasiveness toward the addressee's utterance. "I am thinking of what you have said to me" expresses that the speaker is engaged in inner consultation since he does not understand the context of the addressee's utterance.

3.4 *Ee*

*Ee* is addressee-oriented; the speaker intends to show that he follows the addressee's thought or judgement by saying *ee*. The speaker is willing to identify his own thoughts with the addressee's proposition. He depends on the existence of the addressee both psychologically and emotionally, and will allow the latter's decisions to influence him.
Hence, the addressee's preceding utterance is essential for eliciting the \textit{ee} response. However, the speaker is an individual and so has some freedom to direct his attitudes toward the proposition of the addressee. This can be diagrammed as follows.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{c|c}
(1) & \textbf{Stimulus} \tabularnewline Addressee's & \textit{utterance} \tabularnewline \hline
\textit{ee} & \textbf{Speaker} \\
\hline
(2) & \textbf{Stimulus} \tabularnewline Addressee & \textit{ee} \tabularnewline \hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Figure 6}
\end{figure}

In (1) the speaker has perceived what the addressee has said. In (2) the speaker has linked into the addressee's proposition by saying \textit{ee}. \textit{Ee} occurs at the sentence-initial, sentence-internal and sentence-final positions. Each case will be examined in turn below.

\subsection{3.4.1 Sentence-initial - \textit{ee}}

Consider the following examples:

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(19)] \textbf{A}: "Koohii ga nomita desu ka?"
\begin{tabular}{l}
coffee ACC drink COP Q \\
DES POL
\end{tabular}

"Would you like a cup of coffee?"

\textbf{B}: "\textit{Ee}" \\
"Yes please."
\end{enumerate}
Here the addressee's proposition is: "kōohii ga nomitai desu" (You want to drink coffee). So the speaker is identifying his attitude to the addressee's proposition by saying ee meaning, "I agree with what you propose".

The choice of response between the speaker (the person who says ee) and the addressee is not obligatory since the speaker has a choice of whether or not to follow the addressee. The addressee (A) in (19) at least considers the feelings of the speaker (B). Ee cannot be used in response to a command, where the optional factor is missing.

Situation: B is willing to buy some cigarettes for A.

(20) A: "Tabako o katte koi"  
cigarette ACC buy come  
GER IMP  
"Go and buy some cigarettes for me."

B: * "Ee."

Ee is unacceptable here, since A is making a demand of B, not seeking any information from him. A simply expects B to obey him. The command form is acceptable only in an institutional situation such as in the army, etc. However if A requests B to buy some cigarettes, ee becomes acceptable.

(21) A: "Tabako o kattekitekurenai ka?"  
ACC buy and come Q  
REQ  
PLA  

"Will you go and buy some cigarettes for me?"
B: "Ee."

"Alright."

Ee can also be used in response to questions. Compare the following examples:

**Interrogative:**

(22) A "Kinoo kenkyuushitsu ni ikimashita ka?"
    yesterday office LOC went Q
    "Did you go to the office yesterday."

B: "Ee."
    "Yes."

**Declarative + ne:**

(23) A: "Kinoo kenkyuushitsu ni ikimashita ne?"
    "You went to the office yesterday, didn't you?"

B: "Ee."
    "Yes, I did."

The form of (22) is a YES/NO question; A is inquiring whether or not B went to the office yesterday. The proposition he puts forward in example (22) is that B went to the office yesterday. By way of response B shows that he agrees with A's proposition. In (23) A is seeking confirmation of his proposition from B by adding "ne" at the end of the sentence. So B also shows his agreement by saying ee. In the following examples of wh-questions, B cannot respond by simply saying ee, since
A is seeking specific information rather than simply a YES/NO response. For example:

(24) A: "Ronbun wa itsu owarimasu ka?"
Thesis TOP when finish Q
POL

"When are you going to finish your thesis?"

B:* "Ee."

(25) A: "Ronbun wa doo desu ka?"
Thesis TOP how COP Q

"How is your thesis coming along?"

B:* "Ee."

Here *ee*, as an independent utterance, is unacceptable, because it implies B’s agreement with A’s proposition. However, where A’s proposition is lacking information, B cannot show his agreement with it. *Ee* as a response to an information seeking question is only acceptable in the example given below.

(26) B: "Ee soo desu ne ...."
so COP SFP
POL

" it is so ...."
(Yes ... well ... what can I say?)

"Soo desu" is an anaphoric phrase referring to a preceding utterance. Here in (26) *ee* indicates that B has recognized A’s question and acknowledged his common ground with A, without providing the
Kitagawa's claim that `ee` can be interpreted as meaning "watashi mo soo omoimasu" (I think so, too), cannot be applicable in (26). `Ee` itself does not have an "I think so" component. This can only be a component of `ee` when it derives from the intonation contour, (sharply falling).

Consider the following example:

(27) A: "Ocha wa ikaga desu ka?"

"How about a cup of tea? or Would you like to have a cup of tea?"

B: "Ee."

"Yes, please."

Although (27) is formally a wh-question structure (i.e. `ikaga` = how), A is not seeking new information, but rather is offering B a cup of tea and seeking B's thoughts about his offer, merely a YES or NO response. There is a horizontal interaction between A and B. Therefore B can say `ee` here to indicate that B is on the same common ground with A that he agrees with A's proposition. The following is an example of `ee` being used in response to a proposition requiring new information:

(28) A: "Tokorode hama no hitotachi wa okawari arimasen ka?"

"by the way beach GEN people TOP HON-change be Q"
"By the way, how are the people at the beach?"

B: "Ee minna genki."

"Everybody is fine." (Natsu ga sugite ...: 131)  

Ee in (28) cannot be interpreted as meaning "I think so" since the preceding sentence (wh-question sentence) does not provide an anaphoric element. However ee is acceptable here. A is preferring a greeting but seeking information as well. A subconsciously expects B's positive answer, and B immediately follows A's thought by saying ee before adding the response B expects.

Consider the following example.

Situation: After seeing a film.

(29) A: "Kyoo no eiga wa omoshirokatta ne"
"Today's film was interesting, wasn't it?"

B: "Ee."
"Yes."

A and B share the same experience, and A wants to confirm that B thinks in the same way as he does by adding "ne". In this case, ee is a most suitable response, since ee indicates that B is on the same ground as A.
3.4.2 Sentence-internal – ee

Consider the following example:

Situation: A and B attended the meeting last Friday. A cannot remember the day of a week and he is asking B it.

(30) A: “Miitingu wa senshuu no kinyoobi deshita ka?”
meeting TOP last week GEN Friday COP Q.

“Was the meeting last Friday.”

B: “Miitingu wa senshuu no .... ee kinyoobi deshita.”
“It was .... yes, Friday of last week.”

Ee in (30) does not relate to the context of the sentence in which it occurs, rather it directly refers to A’s expectation than A’s proposition. By inserting ee here, B intends to show that he fully supports what A expects is correct. Therefore a question particle “ka” can be replaced with a sentence final particle “ne” here.

3.4.3 Sentence-final – ee

Consider the following example:

(31) A: “kono samui noni oretachi ga nan no tame this cold because we what purpose kooshite keikaishiteiru no ka sukoshi wa in this way watching COM Q a little TOP kangaete miro ee.”
think see GER IMP

“On a cold (night) like this the job of watchman is thankless: You could at least think about us a little.”

B: “Sumimasen.”
"I am sorry."  (rin'u:145)

In (31) A strongly expects B to share his concerns. By adding ee at the end of the statement, A solicits B's sympathy. Thus the meaning of ee can be invariant at any position in a sentence. It can be presented in the following paraphrase.

*I want to say this to you because I want you to know that I want to say what you want me to say and that we think the same about things.*

"I want to say this to you" and "because I want you to know that I want to say what you want me to say" indicates the speakers favourable response to the addressee's utterance. "I want you to know that we think the same about things" indicates the speaker submits to the addressee.

3.5 **Hai vs Haa vs Ee**

These three RPs (hai, haa, ee) are addressee-oriented, though they differ to a certain degree. They may be ranked in order of increasing magnitude, ee being the response most intensely oriented towards an addressee.

Speaker ———> Addressee

hai  haa  ee

Figure 7.

*Hai* contains a speaker-oriented dimension as well as an addressee-oriented one. This is crucial. It enables *hai* to be an independent one-word utterance without the addressee's preceding
utterance (i.e. pre-emption). The speaker is very certain that he can anticipate the addressee's expectation. This implies the speaker is fully committed to his proposition. **Hai** can also serve as a response to a command or the process of roll-calling.

On the contrary, **ee** is fully addressee-oriented, since the speaker intends to identify the speaker's attitude with the attitude of addressee. Therefore, the speaker himself does not have his own standpoint, from which to make a decision. Such an attitude is flexible because the speaker is dependent on the addressee's proposition. Therefore, if the speaker is required to show his certainty or full-commitment, **ee** cannot be used, for example, in the context of a roll-calling:

(32) A: "Tanaka san."
      Mr/Ms/Mrs/Miss
      "Mr Tanaka"

B: a: "Hai."
   *b: "Fe."
   *c: "Haa."
      "Present."

In this situation, **hah** is also unacceptable since it indicates that the speaker has not fully understood the proposition. **Haa** serves to indicate that the speaker has heard what the other has said, but has not fully understood the context of the utterance. Either the speaker has a literal understanding of what has been said but has not grasped the context, or he has not clearly heard. **Haa** is directed toward the addressee. Therefore this is not a suitable response to a preceding
sentence which requires of the speaker a greater degree of certainty and/or commitment to his own response. **Haa** rarely, if ever, appears at the end of a sentence, since it is used only when the speaker is unclear about A's proposition and has made no decision about his attitude toward it.

Compare the following examples:

(33)A: a: "Rainen Amerika e iku n desu, **hai**.
next year USA LOC go COM COP PLA POL

b: 
*c: 
"I am going to the USA next year, surely"

The speaker is clearly certain about his own decision, so this statement does not offer any opening to an evasive response, such as **haa**. In (33) **hai** indicates that the speaker is confirming his decision to himself as well as to the addressee. **Ee** in (33) indicates that the speaker quite clearly anticipates the addressee's expectation identifying his own attitude with that of the addressee.

Thus, each of these RPs (**hai, haa, ee**) shares common properties as response particles, however each of them has a different core meaning. They are not variants of some single response particle.

It is time for us to combine the core meaning of each RP, (**aa, un, hai, haa, ee**) with the socio-pragmatic factors and examine them in order to fully establish the whole meaning of each RP:
"Any account of meaning in language must (a) be faithful to the facts as we observe them, and (b) must be as simple and generalized as possible. If we approach meaning entirely from the pragmatic point of view, or entirely from a semantic point of view, these requirements are not met; however, if we approach meaning from a point of view which combines semantics and pragmatics, the result can be satisfactory explanation in terms of these two criteria." (Leech 1983: 7) (Emphasis is mine)

4.1 The RPs (hai, haa, ee, aa, un) in speech situations.

In this chapter, the complete meaning of each RP will be presented through its semantic - socio-pragmatic components in terms of "semantic primitives" or "near semantic primitives". The core paraphrases that are outlined in Chapters 2 and 3 will be applied to the whole meanings of these RPs (hai, haa, ee, aa, un) with socio-pragmatic factors.

The main function of RPs is to serve in the verbal expressions of one’s reactive response to the stimulus. The relationship between the speaker [the person who says hai, haa, ee, aa, un] and the addressee is centred.16

These RPs correspond to the speech level used by the speaker. Socio-pragmatic factors such as relative social status, speech situation, speaker's gender etc. all influence the speech level. The different speech levels are determined by the psychological and social relationship between the participants. Therefore, the analysis of these RPs must be considered within the context of discourse. As different speech levels reflect the Japanese social structure, we shall briefly describe those factors in Japanese society which will facilitate understanding in the

---

context of the use of RPs under discussion.

**Social Background**

Japanese society is based on vertical relationships, in comparison with most Western societies which are based on horizontal relationships (Nakane 1970). The ranking order in society plays a key role in determining the appropriate behaviour and use of language. For example, the ranking order in Japanese society is crucially related to the Japanese honorific language and complex first and second person pronouns system (Harada 1976, Suzuki). It is also associated with the term "--- rashii (be like) (Ide et al.: 1985).

If one is a member of Japanese society, one cannot escape one's role, which is determined in relative terms by the relationship between participants in a discourse. For example, it is probably universal that if one is a married woman, has children, and works as a teacher, one has at least five roles; as a housewife, a wife, a mother, a woman and a professional. So one is expected to behave "shufurashiku" (housewife like), "tsumarashiku" (wife like), "hahaoyarashiku" (motherly), "onnarashiku" (womanly), "senseirashiku" (teacher like) in each appropriate situation. In Japanese, self-address reflects one's role at the time of speaking: for instance, "watakushi" (I - male/female), "watashi" (I - female), "atashi" (I - female - more casual than watashi), "okaasan" (mother), "sensei" (Mr/Mrs/Miss [teacher]). Each selection of a mode of self-address is determined by the relationship of the speaker with her interlocutor. In general, she calls herself "watashi/watakushi" (I), depending on the situation; to her children "okaasan" (mother) and to her students "sensei" (teacher). The self-address first-person pronoun and the second person singular pronoun that she uses to her interlocutor
corresponds to the speech level of the interaction. If one violates the expected role, by inappropriate language use, one will be socially punished, that is, one will lose face. To maintain face is the most important consideration in Japanese society. Hill et al., explains this in terms of the "concept of wakima", which is the fundamental principle underlying politeness in Japanese. No single English word translates wakima adequately, but 'discernment' reflects its basic idea (Hill et al. 1986:348). As long as one is a member of Japanese society, one must follow the concept of "wakima" and put oneself in the appropriate role, which is determined by the relationship between the participants. Every Japanese knows this without being taught.

The idea of "power and solidarity" as employed by R. Brown and A. Gilman (1960) provides an approach to the consideration of the complicated fixed social ranking order existing in Japanese society. "Power" corresponds to the hierarchical social ranking order and "Solidarity" to the sense of groupness, that is, in-groupness and out-groupness. Nakane (1970) states that "... the principle of Japanese social group structure can be seen clearly portrayed in the household structure. The concept of the traditional household institution, "/e", still persists in the various group identities which are termed "uchi", a colloquial form of "/e". These factors demonstrate that the formation of social groups on the basis of fixed frames remains characteristic of Japanese social structure ...".

Since hierarchy within the group is the most important indicator of social status, ranking order is the main factor in determining speech
level. R.A. Martin (1967) describes the system of speech level as follows:

**Address - Axis**

out-groupness  
position  
age-difference  
sex-difference  

Politeness  
more  
less  

Figure 8.

If one talks to someone who does not belong to the same family, school, company or any other group, one automatically knows one should interact with an outsider at the highest politeness level in order to avoid losing face. Hence the speech level is a polite style to the outsider. The Address Axis indicates the ranking order: hierarchical ranking order determines the speech level of the speaker toward his interlocutor.

In this study we suggest that the choice of RPs corresponds to the degree of politeness, based on the above ranking order of the addressee. These social aspects strongly influence the choice of RPs. The degree of politeness increases accordingly indirectness which often leads to a violation of the Gricean Maxims (Grice 1976) i.e., "Cooperative principle". Grice presents four maxims for the Cooperative Principle, Quantity, Quality, Relation and Manner. Each of the definitions is quoted below:

**Quantity:** provide right amount of information:
1. Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of the exchange).
2. Do not make your contribution more informative than is
Required.

**Quality:** try to make your contribution one that is true:
1. Do not say what you believe to be false.
2. Do not say that for which you lack adequate evidence.

**Relation:** Be relevant:

**Manner:** Be perspicuous:
1. Avoid obscurity of expression
2. Avoid ambiguity.
3. Be brief (avoid unnecessary prolixity).
4. Be orderly.

(Cited from Grice 1975)

These Gricean Maxims are based on the logicians’ traditional truth value; therefore they are difficult to apply to language use in the real world context like that of Japanese society, where language use places an emphasis on the social relationship and verbal communication requires a conversational strategy in order to maintain face of participants. Coulmas describes the Japanese society as follows:

To the Japanese, breach of conduct, violation of a social rule, etc. involve first of all loss of face. Face-conscious behaviour is characterized by two correlative attitudes: not embarrassing others and protecting one’s own face. Maintenance of face is one of the central values governing interaction in Japan.

(Coulmas, 1981:83)

It is most important for Japanese speakers to be concerned to maintain face to each other. Brown and Levinson state that "... normally everyone’s face depends on everyone else’s being maintained, and since people can be expected to defend their faces if threatened, and in defending their own to threaten other’s faces, it is in general in every participant’s best interest to maintain each others' face, ... ". It is also a universal phenomenon that people try to convey indirectly what they
mean, especially if a negative response is in order. This phenomenon can be seen much more obviously in Japanese society than in European societies. The Japanese prefer to express their opinion or attitude indirectly, so a rich variety of RPs exists in Japanese language. The existence of these RPs reflects the Japanese society and they are used as conversational strategies.

The following example consists of indirectness of the speaker by saying *haa* in order to maintain face of participants.

Situation: A is a detective and is investigating a murder. A is asking B (a police photographer) to develop the film which was found in the camera that belonged to the deceased (Mr. Yamashita).

(1) A1: "Yamashita to iyu hito wa ichimai mo Mr Yamashita QUOT say person TOP ONE

satsueishiteinakatta ne?"

take a picture SFP

PERF

PLA/NEG

"The person who is called Mr. Yamashita has not taken any pictures, hasn't he?"

B1 "Soo desu. Kamera ni sootenshita mama de, so COP camera DAT put still

POL PLA

fuirumu kauntaa no suuji de wa hitokoma mo film counter GEN number INSTOP one

satsueishiteimasen."

take a picture

PERF

POL/NEG

---

"That's right. The film is still in the camera and according to the film counter no pictures were taken."

A2 "Maa nen no tame dakedo, fuirumu o well to be certain though film ACC genzooshitemitekurenaika." develop request PLA

"Well, to be certain, can you have the film developed?"

B2 "Haa...."

"Yes."

The author describes how B responds to A: his face expressed his feeling that it is unnecessary to develop the film, since the film counter indicated that not even one picture was taken. Here the social setting constrains the choice of RPs for B. A and B are talking about their business and to develop the film is B's job as a police photographer under A's supervision. So B has no choice to refuse A's request (A2) even though B does not agree with A. If B directly shows his inner thought toward A, he would not say "haa." here, since haa conveys the speaker's evasive attitude to the addressee. Instead of saying haa, he would say something like "lya, sono hitsuyoo wa nai to omoimasu.(Well, I don't think it's necessary to do so.)" In this case, A clearly perceives what B truly thinks, since there is no ambiguously attributable intention to violate the Gricean Maxims, in B's utterance. However in this social setting A is professionally superior to B and A could command B to do
what A wants B to do, but A did not. A used a Request form instead of Imperative form to convey his desire to B. A loses face by B’s rejection, if B directly shows his objection. So by saying haa, B saves face for A and ultimately saves face for himself. The reason for that is that A derives from B’s utterance (haa) the inference that B disagrees with A, and may feel he will express his appreciation of B’s labour with a word of something like that in order to maintain a positive relationship. Thus it is apparent that haa violates the maxim of Quality, since one of the semantic features of haa that is evasiveness is antagonistic to the Maxims of Quality and Manner. Given the degree of indirectness here is stressed rather than the “Cooperative Principle” because the Quality Maxim is violated by subtlety.

Wierzbicka (in press) points out the nature of natural language as “culture-specific, subjective, and anthropocentric” and argues for the universality of the Cooperative Principle. Language use as in Japanese society depends heavily on socio-pragmatic factors, therefore we should analyse the meaning of the elements of language in question from a point of view other than the Gricean Maxims. Of course the Gricean Maxims and other principles like Leech’s “Politeness Principle” conspire to provide an explanation of the choice of RPs to some extent.

Referring to these five RPs, there is another factor of politeness which should be taken into consideration. This factor is treated in Japanese language textbooks or novels as “women’s expression” or “women’s language” (R. Lakoff, 1972:907-926). “Women’s language” is

---

18 See Leech (1983:79) Leech’s term “Politeness Principle”
19 cf. Leech (1983:80)
generally more polite than "men's language".

Formality is also a factor of politeness. It appears mainly in institutional situations. This is also determined by the "power" relationship, between the speaker and the addressee.

"Indirectness", "femininity" and "formality" should be investigated as socio-pragmatic scales. In this study we shall follow the concepts of "power relationship" is explicated by R. Brown and A. Gilman's term and of "face", using Brown and Levinson's term (1987). What follows, therefore, will be an analysis of these determining factors being interwoven with the degree of "power" and "solidarity" in-groupness referring to their concepts. Each RP will be examined as it occurs, in a given speech situation, by comparing examples. Following this, we shall endeavour to present the whole meaning of these RPs in terms of their semantic - socio-pragmatic components. The Gricean Maxims will be considered wherever applicable.

4.2 The speaker-oriented RPs (aa, un) in the speech situation.

Aa and un are used by a speaker, both in interaction with an addressee and in "self-talk".

Aa is used in self-talk either where the speaker is actually alone or where the speaker momentarily disregards the existence of the addressee. There are two levels at which aa can be employed.

In the case of aa, the original sense of aa synchronically remains. Most Japanese grammarians, for example Suzuki, classify aa as an

\[ \text{cf Brown P. & Levinson S.C. (1987:61-64)} \]
exclamation as well as a response particle. In this paper, the treatment of aa is broken up into aa (i) and aa (ii)\(^{21}\), in consideration of socio-pragmatic influences in the context of a discourse. Aa (i) can be uttered in the speaker-oriented sense where it is not necessarily directed at the addressee. On the other hand aa (ii) can be uttered in response to an addressee’s proposition, although the speaker disregards the reaction of the addressee.

\(\text{Un}\) is also used in self-talk, however when using un the speaker is assuming two roles - that of the questioner and that of the respondent - in an attempt to clarify his thoughts. This questioner/respondent relationship is also applicable to the situation where “ordinary” dialogue between 2 people takes place. Here un is employed on occasions of great intimacy. The speaker renders the psychological distance between himself and the addressee null and void through the process of identification. There is great solidarity [in-groupness] implied by this usage of un. The speaker is also absolutely direct about his own attitude or judgement (“positive politeness” in terms of P. Brown and Levinson). In addition the use of un is radically effected by socio-pragmatic factors such as the speakers gender and status. We will now examine aa and un respectively.

4.2.1 Aa

Aa can be seen to operate at two levels within a speech situation.

\(^{21}\)Many linguists have analysed particles such as “well” or “just” and postulated a single meaning for them (R. Lakoff 1973), however they fail to provide a single meaning. It is inevitable that they postulate several meanings, since the original sense of a word diachronically differs from current semantic representation. (Goddard, 1979:125).
These are described below as \textit{aa} (i) and \textit{aa} (ii).

4.2.1.1 \textbf{Aa (i)}

Although it is used where the speaker is talking to the addressee, \textit{aa(i)} is not intentionally directed towards the addressee, but toward speaker since it is speaker-oriented. While the speaker does not intend to disregard the existence of the addressee and while he is still interested in maintaining communication with the addressee, he utters \textit{aa} as a spontaneous exclamation that serves to indicate that he is still taking in what he has heard, and that he will speak further.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A is at the tobacconist asking B where Mr Nozaki's house is.

(2) A: \textit{"Kono atarini Nozakisan to iyu uchi nai?"}  
here around Mr Nozaki QUOT say house be PLA NEG  
"Is there any house around here belonging to a Mr Nozaki?"

B: \textit{"Nozakisan? Daigaku no sensei no?"}  
Mr Nozaki university GEN professor GEN  
"Mr Nozaki? Do you mean the university professor?"

A: \textit{"Aa daigaku no sensei na no?"}  
university GEN professor COM  
*b Un  
*c Hai  
*d Haa  
*e Fe
"Oh, is he a university professor?" (Yoru no...:148)

A had not realized that Mr Nozaki was a university professor, therefore he reacts to what he has heard with surprise. In this example *aa* is subconsciously uttered at a private or speaker-oriented level. A's following utterance is a throwing back question to B. Therefore (b),(c),(d) and (e) are not acceptable.

Situation: A who is a detective visits a second hand bookshop to collect some information from its owner.

(3) A: "Jitsuwa the fact is kore o this ACC otaku HON+your place
de katta mono nan da keredo." LOC bought article COM COP though PLA

"The fact is, I am the person who bought this magazine at your shop."

B: "Aa naka ni kiri torareta bubun cut out part
inside LOC PASS PLA
ganai to iyu no deshoo. NOM be QUOT say COM COP PLA PLA CONJ

"You are saying that there are some parts cut out of the magazine."

A: "Iya sono koto o monku i ni no that matter ACC complaintment say PLA

kita n ja nai desu yo. Kono zasshi
"No, that is not what I am complaining about, I want to know from where you obtained this magazine."

"Aa(i) soo nan desu ka. Sore wa Emori-biyooshitsu no Emorisan kara desu. Emori beauty salon GEN Mrs Emori from COP POL "Is that so? I got it from Mrs Emori the Emori Beauty Salon."

(Furuzasshi: 126)

These above examples of **aa** show the speaker's reaction to the addressee's remark. The relationship between the shop owner and the customer does not impose restrictions on the use of **aa(i)**, either in terms of the shop owner's status or the user's gender, since being speaker-oriented, it is not intended to convey anything of the speaker's attitude or judgement to the addressee. In the following example, **aa** is used by a female:

Situation: A (male) is B's husband subordinate. B on the phone is asking A to meet her.
A: "Nanika ohnanshi ga aru soo de ..."
    such as HON talk NOM be REP PLA
    "I have heard you have something to talk to me about."

B: "Ee ... watashi no kotoba no imi wakaru deshoo?"
    meaning understand COP PLA CONJ
    "I think you know what I mean."

A: "Saa? Donna koto deshoo?"
    well what sort of COM COP CONJ
    "Well, what is it you wish to talk about?"

B: "Aa wakatta wa. Sobani dareka iru n deshoo?"
    understood SFP nearby someone be COM COP PLA CONJ
    "Ah, I understand. You can't speak freely because there is someone there with you."
    (Natsu no ... :104)

B is puzzled by A's hesitance, and in an attempt to elicit a reason for this reaction offers in example (4) her interpretation of the situation.

In these examples, the use of aa is not restricted by such sociopragmatic factors as the speaker's social status, or gender, since they
are speaker-oriented and are not directed toward the addressee. The speaker does not intend to contribute to the interaction, but by saying *aa* the speaker unintentionally contributes. In this sort of context *aa* can be interpreted in two ways by the addressee, either as a response directed towards him or as the speaker engaging in self-talk. The level of politeness of the speaker’s speech serves as the main due in distinguishing between these alternate interpretations. Self-talk is conducted in plain style, so a switch to polite style is usually indicative of the intention of the speaker to direct his comment to the addressee.

The above discussion can be illustrated in the following table (2).

**Table 2.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Style</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Realization of speaker’s inner thought</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From now on ">" indicates older or superior and "=" denotes equality with the addressee.

"Known" is divided into and indicates close, neutral (N), and relationship.

"known (close)" indicates the relationship between friends, among family members or colleagues.

"known (N)" indicates the relationship between acquaintance, colleague or classmate.

"known (far)" indicates the relationship e.g. between management worker or a vice-chancellor—student, they may have met, but the status of the management or vice-chancellor is extremely superior to that of the worker or student.
From the above observation, we may conclude that aa(i) has the following semantic pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive something.
(b) I say to myself what I perceived.
(c) I am going to say something more after this.
(d) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker reacts to an external stimulus. Component (b) shows that the speaker is talking to himself about his reaction. Component (c) expresses that the speaker intends to explain what he thinks about.

We shall now discuss aa(ii) as it is used at the second level in the speech situation.

4.21.2 Aa(ii)

The second major use of aa that we can determine is where the speaker uses it in response to the addressee's questions, requests, and/or suggestions. Aa is neither suitable nor acceptable as a response to a command. Its use indicates that the speaker has power over the addressee, i.e. the speaker is under no obligation to consider the addressee's subsequent reactions. Moreover aa indicates that minimum cooperation and minimum information is all the speaker will give in response to the addressee. In terms of the Gricean Maxims, it is arguable that both Quality and Manner Maxims are violated. The speaker's minimum cooperation does not imply any real seriousness, nor does it indicate a lack of interest. Similarly, the preferring of a minimum
contribution gives the impression that the speaker agrees with the addressee’s proposition, though he does not convey his whole response. This indicates a certain degree of impoliteness, and gives the impression of the speaker’s arrogant attitude. This is in violation of the Manner Maxim.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A is a driver of a lorry who has delivered an ornament to the museum and is asking B, who is the director of the museum, for his signature on the receipt.

(5) A: "Sain o negaishimasu." signature ACC HON request POL

"Could I have your signature, please?"

B: a: "Aa. Kore de ii ka ne?" this INST alright Q SFP
? b: "Un
* c: "Hai
* d: "Haa
* e: "Ee

"Is this alright?" (Mateba...:107)

Here it is necessary for A to obtain B’s signature. B is socially superior to A. Therefore the setting allows B to say aa so does not have to consider his reactions. The speech level of B’s following sentence is in plain form, and does not show any respect toward or interest in A. Hai, haa and ee being addressee-oriented and requiring the polite speech style would be inappropriate in this situation where B does not need to maintain face. Un could be used here, although because the relationship
between A and B is not an intimate one, it would not be very appropriate. B's attitude towards A is authoritarian as he does not have to be cooperative in order to achieve a maximally efficient degree of communication. Here is a further example of manner and Quality violation.

Situation: B (a taxi driver) is asking A who has just got into the taxi if he is tailing someone.

(6) A: "Ano takushii o ottekure." (follow that taxi)
B: "Bikoo desu ka?" (are you tailing the taxi?)
A: "Aa. Uchi no ofukuro tokidoki hossa o okosuto takushii no untenshu o korosu kuse ga aru n da yo." (When my mother occasionally takes a fit, she has a habit of killing taxi-drivers.)

"Follow that taxi."
"Are you tailing the taxi?"
"Aa. Uchi no ofukuro tokidoki hossa o okosuto takushii no untenshu o korosu kuse ga aru n da yo."

"Un."
"Hai."
"Haa."
"Aa."

(Mateba kairo ... :19)
It is apparent from the context of the novel that A has imposing physical stature and is a smart private detective. His desire to act efficiently and urgently is evident from the way in which he started the conversation with the taxi-driver in the 'Imperative' form. The taxi-driver confirmed A's request by asking "Bikoo deou ka?" (Are you tailing the taxi?) instead of saying "Certainly". However, there is a risk in using the Imperative form to a person whom A does not know well. The setting helps the situation. A's use of the Imperative is encouraged by the fact that he pays the taxi-driver for his services. The taxi-driver seems somehow to be involved in the situation and shows his curiosity by asking A whether he is tailing the taxi. A responds to the taxi-driver's question by saying "aa". The effect of this sentence is that A, who has achieved what he set out to do namely pursue the leading taxi, brings an end to the taxi-driver's questioning. There is a certain element of risk involved here in that if A's words should offend the taxi-driver's feelings, he will not achieve his desired objective. However A has power over the taxi-driver. This is according to P. Brown, S Levinson (1978:99-105), A has performed what Levinson and Brown (1978,66-3) call a "Face Threatening Act" (hereafter FTA) with maximum efficiency in the opening conversation. While A's use of FTA was, in this case, successful, the same time, he needs to save face in the eyes of the taxi-driver, so that he had at least to respond to the taxi-driver's question, but he avoids committing himself in his response and keeps psychological distance. Consequently "aa" is most suitable. "Un" could be used here although it is not preferable, since A does not want to
establish solidarity with B. The other three particles (hai, haa, ee) are not acceptable here: A's speech level does not correspond to the use of these three particles since A is superior to B psychologically as well as situationally so he does not need to make an effort to maintain face of B, and A uses in plain speech level toward B. Hence he chooses the RP aa which conveys an evasive and arrogant implication.

The following example illustrates masculine arrogance as implied by aa.

Situation: A is a female detective and B is her husband and on this occasion is her assistant. They have been making an investigation, as directed by their employer and B thinks that they have completed the job.

(7) B: "Yoshi kaeroo."  
OK go home  
PLA

"OK, let's go home."

A: "Ii no?"  
alright COM

"Is that all right?"

B: a: "Aa."  
b: "Un."  
*c: "Hai."  
*d: "Haa."  
*e: "Ee."  

"Yes." (Nigashita ... : 166)

As speech style restricts the usage of RPs, hai, haa, ee are unacceptable. Within the context of this novel A is an ideal masculine, intellectual character. His speech should therefore be in keeping with
the tough guy's image. In this example (7), achieves this more efficiently than un, since un establishes or maintains solidarity. The use of aa indicates that B disregards the reaction of A, thus implying that B is not ruled by petticoat government, but rather is playing the role of masculine husband.

Aa is used almost exclusively by males, serving as a response intended to show the speaker's judgement or thought in the interaction between "power" relationships. The purpose behind the choice of aa is that the speaker intends to use his "power" to keep psychological and social distance from the addressee.

The above discussion can be illustrated in the following table.

**Aa(ii)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male/female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Known (far/extremely close)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Style</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Realization of addressee's remark</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.

From the above observations, we may conclude that aa(ii) has the following semantic - socio-pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive that you want me to say something.
(b) I do not want to say that I do not want to do it.
(c) I think I can say things to you in the way men do to those people if they do not care that these people may feel something bad because of it.
(d) I say this because I do not want you to say anything
more about that.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of what is said. Component (b) shows that the speaker disregards the existence of the addressee. Component (c) spells out that the speaker is arrogant toward the addressee and treats him as one of the low status. Component (d) expresses that the speaker disregards the reaction of the addressee.

4.2.2 Un

Consider the following example.

Situation: A married couple has just come out of the movie theatre. A is the wife and B is her husband.

(8) A "Doo shitano?" how did COM PLA
"What's wrong?"

B a: "Un Hisashiburide eiga nanka mita kara, for a while film such as watch ABL PLA
tsukareta no ka na?" was tired COM Q SFP PLA
"Hum ... I haven't been to see a film for such along time. I wonder if it's made me tired?"

b: "Aa."
*c: "Hai."
*d: "Haa."
*e: "Ee." (Fuirurmu ga ... : 134)
Here *hai, haa* and *ee* are inappropriate in the given situation because they are purely addressee oriented and do not convey the necessary solidarity. *Un* indicates that B has recognized what A has said, and that he intends to provide the requested information to A. In this example, their speech suggests that A and B have established a relationship of firm solidarity and they are absolutely familiar with each other. They are also peers in terms of their age. Therefore their speech style is in plain-form. *Un* is the most natural response to A's utterance because it implies the speaker identifies himself with the addressee. *Aa* is also acceptable, but B's following utterance precludes its use. Had *aa* been used in the above situation it would imply that B intends not to be cooperative in his communication with A, since *aa* conveys both the speaker's disregard for the reaction of the addressee, and the desire to preserve psychological distance. In the following example (9), however, the husband is much older and socially established, even father-like in his attitude towards her. Therefore he makes an effort to establish solidarity with his wife.

Situation: A is asking her husband (B) if he is going to be in charge of an experiment in which a male friend of hers is involved.

(9) A1: "Zairu ga kireta to ka kirenakatta a climbing rope NOM cut QUOT Q cut PLA PLA NEG to ka iu jikken desu ne?" QUOT Q say experiment COP SFP POL
"That is the experiment, is it, to see if the climbing rope breaks or not."

B1: a: "Un."
?b: "Aa."

"Yes, it is."

A2: "O hikiuke ni narimashita no?"
HON took charge of COM

"Are you going to take charge of it?"

?b: "Aa."

"I am."

(Hyooheki: 300-301)

Aa is also acceptable here, however, its use is suggestive of the interpretation that B is disinterested in the topic which A wants to discuss. Since B intends to maintain solidarity with his wife, un is the more appropriate response. Moreover B understands the question and is very clear about his future action, so there is no ambiguity here.

In the following example the relationship is one between male and female friends who went to the same school.

Situation: A, who is a detective, is asking her male friend (B) about a criminal.

(10)A "Imura-kun ... hontooni hannin o shitteiru no?"
Mr Imura truly criminal ACC KNOW COM
PLA

"Mr Imura, do you really know the criminal?"
B is first of all required to give A the requested information i.e. to deny or affirm A's question. B could use an evasive expression, but it is unnecessary for him to do so in this situation. As A and B know each other very well and share certain background information, they do not have to consider communicative strategies as much as they do when they deal with other people, who are unfamiliar to them. They have also maintained the solidarity, so that the use of hai, haa and ee is inappropriate. However, B cannot disregard A's remarks by saying aa since A is a detective and inquires of B the criminal. Therefore un conforms to the situation. In this example, other "in-groupness" markers are present in A's speech. "kun" is a title usually used only by men, but a female who went to the same school as a male conventionally adds "kun" to his name when she addresses him.

The above examples all deal with relationships between females and males who are familiar to each other. Un is always used by males in these examples, and it is their usage of it that is usually noted in language textbooks. The usual textbook explanation is that un is used by males while ee is used by females. (See Review Text: 88-89). Un is firmly speaker-oriented and has no degree of directness, while ee
denotes agreement with the addressee, simply expresses the speaker's opinion based on the addressee's attitude. Females are expected to use indirect modes of speech. Therefore they conventionally tend to use ええ. In the following examples the speech style between A and B is different from the above (10).

Situation: A female and B (male) work in the same office and A is asking B about his wife, who has recently had a baby and is still in hospital.

(11) A "Okusama o genki deshita?"
HON wife HON fine COP (Your) POL
"Is your wife fine?"

B: a: "Un, genki da."
fine COP PLA
b: "Aa, "
*c: "Hai, "
*d: "Haa, "
*e: "Ee, "
"Yes, she is fine." (Rokuonki: 292)

Here, where a certain degree of solidarity exists between A and B, the use of ああ would be inappropriate since ああ does not conform to the solidarity paradigm. However two socio-pragmatic factors restrict the choice of RPs. The first is that of gender. A's use of the polite speech style can be seen in her choice of the honorific form "okusama" (wife) and the honorific prefix "o" of "ogenki" and the polite form of the copula. This is because she is conforming to the expected female role. B, however, uses the plain speech style, e.g. the plain form of the copula
“da” which makes it clear that the speaker is male. In this situation the importance of gender roles are reinforced by the locality. The above conversation occurred in the office-setting so even though the conversation is private the setting does not permit the relaxing of conventional speech patterns. A’s speech level can therefore be seen to be effected by gender and locality factors.

In public, social hierarchy and gender roles are still strictly constrained. This phenomena can be clearly seen in the works of novelists, such as Kunio Tsuji, Yasunari Kawabata, Yasushi Inoue and Yukio Mishima, who rather exaggerate these gender roles because they take account of social or traditional factors in the character’s speech. Whereas, current authors such as Jiroo Akagawa use more unisex expressions, for example:

Situation: A is a female detective and is inquiring of B (female) whether she knows something about a certain criminal.

(12)A  "Sore wa hontoo desu ne?"
that TOP true COP SFP
"That is true, is it?"

B:  "Un. Hontoo yo zanen nagara."
true SFP I am afraid
"I am afraid that it is true."

(Paipu no ... :177)

In (12), the following sentence "Hontoo yo" indicates that the speaker is female, if the speaker was male, he would say "Hontoo da yo." Thus un corresponds to the unisex format.

The unisexism of language is increasing through the influence of
the feminist movement which is encouraging change. Actually Japanese female students at the ANU also state that they use un instead of ee in private speech situations. Thus the use of un has been extended to include both males and females in private speech. The following example is from a live recorded conversation.

Situation: B (daughter) is talking to A (mother) when she (B) just comes back from school.

(13) A1: "Onaka ga suite iru n nara pan tabete ii yo."
"If you are hungry you can eat some bread."

B1 : a: "Un."
b: "Hai."
c: "Ee."
*d: "Haa"
*e: "Aa."
"Okay."

A2: "Taberu?"
"Are you going to eat it?"

b: "Hai."
c: "Ee."
*d: "Haa"
*e: "Aa."
"Sure."

(Rokuonki: 278)
In these examples (12) and (13), un is used by a female. In (13) the daughter responds to her mother by saying un, although in other circumstances she may be expected to use hai or ee, but these would not be appropriate given her mother’s speech style which is in the plain form and conveys a casual attitude. Here the most important factor is solidarity, therefore, un is the most acceptable. Haa and aa denote evasiveness, so that they are unacceptable here. Their use would violate Quality and Manner Maxims.

Un is used to establish or maintain solidarity between the speaker and the addressee, since the nature of un is that the speaker links the addressee with herself. Therefore when the speaker is equal or superior to the addressee, un can be used as a device of solidarity.

Children are also members of society, and as such are expected to conform to certain roles. In Japanese society, they are not allowed to use evasive expressions when they are asked to express their attitudes or opinions, particularly within the context of such institutional circumstances as their school life. Rather they are expected to give direct responses to their sponsors. Hai and un can be used when the speaker is quite clear about the proposition, so when children feel that there is solidarity between themselves and an addressee, and they have good feelings toward that addressee, they can use un in the interaction with both in-group people and out-group people. The following example is from a novel:

Situation: B (the boy) knows something about a criminal act and wants to tell someone about it. A (adult male) notices B.
(14) A: "Oi booya nanika hanashitai
Hey little boy such as speak
koto ga arundaroo?"
things NOM have
"Hey little boy, do you have something to say to me?"

B: a: "Un."
b: "Hai."
*c: "Haa."
*d: "Ee."
*e: "Aa."
"Yes."

(Mateba kairo ... :188)

Where the author describes B's pleasure at having been noticed and his enthusiasm in responding, nodding his head delightedly and saying "un". In this circumstance, B could respond with either hai or un. However, I assume that un conveys the more child-like response. The boy has finally found someone – who wants to talk to him and someone whom he wants to talk to, so he spontaneously shows his intimacy to A. The other expressions (haa, aa, ee) would be unacceptable in this example, because the component of 'evasiveness' which is inherent in both haa and aa is here incompatible with the boys eagerness to impart his information. The boy wants to tell A something about the criminal, so his attitude is open toward A, therefore ee would not be suitable here because ee is too submissive. In general, children are not expected to respond evasively to YES/NO questions posed by adults, because the hierarchy between adults and children is such that adults are more

So far we have seen examples of un in sentence-initial position, where it mainly serves as a response to the addressee's remarks. Un indicates the speaker's recognition, therefore the preceding utterance of the addressee can be either a YES/NO question, a wh-question, a Declaration or a Request. However the preceding utterance cannot be a command since un serves as a recognition response to establish or to maintain solidarity between the speaker and the addressee.

As a response to a command un is inappropriate. Children may use it, but they will be warned to use "hai", since adults expect their children to be obedient.

Situation: A (mother) is scolding B (her child) because of a mess in his room. She is using the polite Imperative form (command).

(15)A: "Heya o katazukenasai." 
   room ACC clean up
   POL IMP

   B: a: "Un."
   b: "Hai."

Given the in-groupness that prevails here "un" is an acceptable response.

Un occurs sentence-internally as well as sentence-initially.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A and B are friends and B is selling a ticket for a tea-ceremony.
Example (2) in Introduction.

A: "Watashi nanimo moo wasurete dekinai

I nothing already forget unable

kedo ..."

though

"I'm afraid I can't do that anymore, I've forgotten everything."

B: a: "A soo iu no wa betsu ni un

Oh so say COMP TOP not particularly really

kamawanai to omou."

mind QUOT think

PLA PLA

NEG

"Oh, don't worry about that, really I don't think it matters."

In this example un is totally speaker-oriented since it has not been uttered intentionally. It is the speaker's private response to her own inner consultation, and has not been directed toward the addressee. If the speaker intended to convey the confirmation of her inner consultation she would have used ee or hai. In this context, both haa and aa are totally inappropriate because of the implication of evasiveness that they convey.

All of these factors governing the appropriateness of un are summed up in the following table.
Un

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>male/(female)</td>
<td>male/female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Known (close)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Style</td>
<td>Plain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Informal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Recognition of addressee's remark.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.

From the above observations we may conclude that un has the following semantic - socio-pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive that you want me to say something.
(b) I am sure I know what you want me to say.
(c) I think I can say things to you as I say things to myself, many men or children say things to people whom they know, and for whom they have good feelings.
(d) I say this because I want you to know that I am sure of what I say.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of what is said. Component (b) shows that the speaker is convinced of his anticipation about the addressee's expectation. Component (c) spells out the solidarity between the speaker and the addressee, so that he can talk to the other addressee as he is talking to a family member or a very
close friend. In (d) the speaker is convinced his own proposition which is uttered toward the addressee.

4.3 The Addressee-Oriented RPs (hai, haa, ee) in the speech situation.

We have already investigated the core meanings of hai, haa, and ee in chapter 3, where we noted that, being addressee oriented they usually co-occur with the polite speech style. Each of them conveys the speaker’s polite attitude toward the addressee, indicative of the speaker’s desire that the addressee not be caused to lose face. However, the nature and degree of politeness conveyed by these RPs varies from one to another. In the following table we set up three semantic features which we may label semantic based on the distinction between semantics and socio-pragmatics defined above. These features are semantic because they are invariant regardless of the speech situation.

(1) conviction - hai
(2) submissiveness - ee
(3) evasiveness - haa

"Conviction" indicates that the speaker is convinced either of the correctness of his own proposition or the correctness of his anticipation, as these occur during the process of his interaction with the addressee. The speaker conveys this conviction toward the addressee by saying hai.

"Submissiveness" indicates that the speaker submits himself to
the addressee’s proposition and intends to convey that submissiveness to
the addressee, in order to maintain face for both speaker and the
addressee. The submissive response is ee and is conventionally used by
woman. “It is a well-known hypothesis that women are more polite than
men in their use of language.” (Ide et. al., 1986).

“Evasiveness” indicates either that the speaker is not sure what
he has heard or if its contextual significance, or that he avoids
committing himself to the addressee’s proposition. The evasive response
is haa. Neutral evasiveness is a strategic technique indicating that the
speaker wants to avoid committing himself to the addressee’s
propostion, either because he fails to understand it, or because it is
undesirable. Haa maintains face by protecting the faces of both the
speaker and the addressee.

Below we investigate the manner in which socio-pragmatic
factors such as out-groupness, social status, age, sex, in-groupness,
etc., correlate with these features of politeness in respect to hai, haa
and ee respectively.

4.3.1 Hai

The type of politeness inherent in hai can be interpreted as
”conviction”. The speaker’s conviction about his own proposition is
conveyed toward the addressee. In saying hai, the speaker both
establishes a break between the preceding verbal or non-verbal
utterance and his following utterance and also draws the addressee’s
attention toward that following utterance. It is the speaker’s intention
"I will finish my thesis. Yes"

Here the speaker anticipates the thoughts of the addressee’s mind and shows his determination to the addressee by adding hai at the end of the sentence. The speaker declares and confirms his will to the addressee. If he was confirming his will to himself (inner talk), he would use un instead of hai.

Cf "Ronbun o shiageyoo un."

Consider the following example:

Situation: A is filling in a form but cannot remember what day of the week it is so he asks B.

(17) A: "Kyoo wa nanyoobi desu ka?"
 today TOP what day of the week COP Q

"What day of the week is it today?"

B: "Hai, kinyoobi desu."
Friday COP

By saying hai, B shows not only that he fully understands A’s question but also that he is sure of his response. The proposition "Today is Friday" is the truth, and since B clearly knows this fact, he can reply
with conviction. B obviously knows that A is filling in a form, in other words he knows the context of the question, therefore haa is inappropriate here, since haa conveys an evasive attitude toward the addressee. Haa would only be acceptable if B did not notice what A was doing, and therefore had not immediately apprehended the context of A’s utterance. Aa is a possible response, for by saying aa the speaker has searched his memory and recalled the date. Un, however does not fit here. A and B use the polite speech style and this implies that they may be strangers to each other or at least they do not know each other well. There has been no solidarity established between them yet. In addition, since it does not cost B to give A some requested information in this situation, then it is unnecessary for B to confirm the proposition to himself at first, if he is certain about the date. For that reason un is unacceptable here.

Consider a further example:

Situation: A and B went to see a film, on the way back, A asks B about the film.

(18)A: "Kyoo no eiga wa omoshirokatta desu ne."
    "Today's film was interesting, wasn't it?"

B: a "Hai."
   b "Haa."
   c "Ee."
   d "Aa."
   e "Un."

"Yes."
A and B share the experience of seeing the film and A is seeking agreement with his opinion of the film from B by adding SFP 'ne' at the end of the sentence. In this case all five RPs are acceptable. However ee is the most suitable, since ee indicates the speaker's agreement with the addressee's proposition.

Hai on the other hand expresses the speaker's conviction that he agrees that the film was interesting. The difference between ee and hai in these examples can be expressed as follows:

- ee - Yes, I agree with you, you are right in thinking it was interesting.
- hai - Yes, I thought it was interesting.

Haa is also acceptable, however, it does not show whether or not B agrees with A about the film. He has reserved his opinion, relegating it to the back seat, as it were. A may ask another question after hearing haa as a response from B, for example, "omoshiroku nakatta desu ka? (Didn't you enjoy it?)", or something like that, in an attempt to draw a clear opinion from B. Aa is also a possible response, but, in using it B would disregard his reaction to see the film, so that A would be in the position of maintaining face of not having to consider for both B and himself. This would indicate either that B is extremely superior to A or there is strong solidarity between A and B. Un is rather marginal. By saying un, the speaker shows he momentarily at least identifies the existence of the addressee. He utters un only toward himself rather than the addressee showing only his recognition of the first speaker's utterance. Kitagawa (1977) differentiates between hai and ee by arguing
that *hai* is a recognition response spoken with respect while *ee* is an agreement response. We basically agree with his interpretation, but would like to stress that *hai* is not only a recognition response, it also conveys to the other addressee the speaker's conviction that his response to his own assertive attitude toward the addressee. The following example shows that *hai* indicates something more than just B's recognition of A's utterance.

Situation: A (a female teacher) is conducting an oral examination of one of her female students (B)

(19) A: "Soredewa hajimeni ookina mondai o kikimasu yo."

"Well, first of all, I'll ask you a general question... What is the essence of history?"

B: "Hai. Rekishi to wa kaikyuukan no toosoo de arimasu."

"Yes ma'am. History is about conflict between the classes."

(Wakaihito: 359)

Here, social setting (the relationship between a teacher and a student in the examination room) restricts the speaker to the choice of *hai*, however, the speaker intends to convey confidence and conviction in
her response to the teacher. **Hai** essentially establishes a break between A's utterance and B's following utterance, and draws the addressee's attention to what B is going to say. Therefore **hai** is a response of conviction rather than one denoting mere recognition. As the following example will show this is the favoured or most suitable response of a soldier toward a general.

Situation: A general (A) is talking to a soldier (B) in the army.

(20)A: "Himitsu ga mamooreru ka?"
secret NOM keep Q.
PLA
POT
"Can you keep a secret?"

B a: "**Hai.** "Yes, sir."
?b: "**Haa.** "Well, sir."
*c: "**Ee.**"
*d: "**Un.**"
*e: "**Aa.**"

The social distance between A and B is at a maximum. B does not have any choices here, rather he must show his obedience toward A. A on the other hand does not have to concern himself with maintaining B's 'face'. In this context B is expected to demonstrate his attitude toward A, by responding in a positive, enthusiastic and committed manner, a response indicative of the fact that A's order is consistent with B's own will. On the other hand, **Ee** is unacceptable here, since it indicates that the speaker seeks rapport with the addressee by submitting passively to the addressee's proposition which may or may not be consistent with his
own will. Un conveys the speaker's positive attitude toward the addressee, however in this circumstance status ranking marks it as inappropriate. Aa is totally unacceptable here, since it is entirely inappropriate for B to ignore either the existence or the response of the addressee. B is required to accord total obedience toward A. However the content of A's question gives B little option, for in reality few people would deny their ability to keep a secret in this setting. For this reason, haa could also be acceptable here, because it conveys evasiveness in this situation. The use of haa denotes B's inner consultation of the question, a strategy which would maintain face for both the speaker and the addressee. However, ultimately the speaker has no real option between a precise or an evasive response. The general would demand a precise and predictable answer to his question. B's evasive answer can be used as a strategy to demonstrate his reluctant attitude that is not a favourable attitude given the nature of the relationship between a general and a soldier reluctance and unlikely. However the power relationship between them requires the speaker's expression of conviction - which in many context can be conventionally interpreted as "formality". Here again, social status clearly constrains the participants' roles. A student cannot choose to respond "yes" or "no" to his teacher. The other RPs (haa, ee, aa, un) are totally unacceptable, since the social setting - that involving status between a teacher and a student responds to the teacher by saying "I'm here", however, the teacher expects and asks him to respond properly by using "hai".

Consider the following situation.

Situation: Roll-calling in the classroom. A is a teacher and B and C are pupils.
(21) A1: "Saa minna jibun no namae o yobaretara ookina koe de call loud voice PASS COND henjisuru n desu yo. Okada Isokichi kun!" respond COM COP SFP Mr. PLA POL "Children, please answer loudly when I call your name. Isokichi Okada."

B1: "(silence)."

A2: "Okada Isokichi kun. Inai n desu ka?" be COM COP Q PLA POL "Isn't he here?"

B2: "Iru."

A3: "Ja haitte henjisuru no yo." well QUOT respond COM SFP PLA "Well, you should answer by saying hai."

A4: "Tsugi wa Takeshita Takeichi kun." next TOP "Next, Taekichi Takeshita."

C1: "Hai." "Yes, madame."
A5: "Soo soo hakkiri yoku ohneji dekita wa. So so clearly well HON+response was able SFP PLA

"Yes, good! That's how you should answer."
(Nijuushi no.... 225)

These are institutionalized situations where the appropriate degree of formality is dictated by convention. Here, where there is no choice of response the speaker cannot use strategies to avoid his social commitments. The choice of RP is determined by what R. Brown and A. Gilman (1960) call "the power semantic".

Consider the following example:
Situation: A (male) is commanding B to buy some cigarettes for him.

Example (20) in chapter 3.
A: "Tabako o katte koi." cigarettes ACC buy and come GER IMP
"Go and buy me some cigarettes."
B a: "Hai."
?b: "Haa."
?c: "Aa."
*d: "Un."
*e: "Ee."
"(Certainly)."

The choice of RP is determined here by the relationship between B and A. A is socially superior to B and is therefore in the position where he can command B, who appropriately responds with hai. Ee is inappropriate here (See chapter 4.3.3.). Haa may be possible as a
strategy to avoid commitment, for example where the speaker pretends that he does not understand what is said and simply shows awareness of the existence of A. Aa is also possible, because the implication that the speaker disregards the reaction of the addressee is indicative of a certain air of arrogance, through which an equilibrium arises in the power relationship between A and B. Such a relationship may be that of close-brothers who have extremely firm solidarity where they do not have to consider maintaining face with each other. Un conveys the speaker's attitude of solidarity with the addressee, so here where there is no such relationship between A and B it is an inappropriate response. Ee is unacceptable here. (See chapter 3:48)

Within the wider context of the above examples, although the participants have different social status, they know each other, and there is some familiarity between them. However the power relationship between them requires that the speaker's response demonstrates conviction which so interpreted as a type. The interpretation of politeness as a result of conventionalized formality is also applicable where the speaker and the addressee belong to different groups. Under such circumstances politeness towards each other is the only way to maintain face. For example in the Japanese society we strongly feel obliged to follow the conventional standard of formality for a stranger.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A stranger (A) is looking for the Menzies Library and asks B for directions.

(22 A: "Sumimasenga Menzizu toshokan wa doko desu ka? excuse me. Menzies Library TOP where COP Q
"Excuse me, can you tell me where the Menzies Library is?"

B a: "Hai Asoko desu."  
    over there COP POL

b: Aa
*c: Haa
*d: Un
*e: Ee

"Yes, it's over there."

Here A is seeking information from B. Being of a relatively minor nature A's requirement does not cost B very much so in such a situation, B could reasonably be expected to be willing to help A. By the way of response B shows his recognition of what A has requested by saying hai, and then confidently offers the requested information. Recall that ee indicates the speaker's agreement with the addressee's proposition. In a case like this where the addressee's proposition is a wh-question, requiring a more specific response than simple agreement, the choice of ee is clearly unacceptable. Haa which conveys the speaker's evasive attitude toward the addressee, is also patently unacceptable in this situation. Un indicates solidarity toward the addressee, however, since A and B are strangers in this example there can be no relationship of solidarity between them. Aa may possible be acceptable here, though only when used as self talk, not as an appropriate response to an addressee (A).

As mentioned earlier Kitagawa (1977) treats hai as a recognition
response with respect and examines a wide range of examples. We shall cite some of his example here:

(23) A: "Ano Tanaka sensei to iu sensei wa that teacher QUOT say TOP zuibun kireina kata desu ne." quite beautiful person COP SFP HON POL "That teacher whose name is Ms Tanaka is very beautiful, isn't she?"

B: a "Fe." * b "Hai."

(Kitagawa 1977: 71)

The person who speaks in this way using the SFP "ne" is seeking agreement from his interlocutor. Therefore "ee" is a most suitable response.

Kitagawa claims that "hai" is unacceptable here, because "hai" does not show the speaker's opinion about the interlocutor's statements, but merely operates as a recognition response. Kitagawa defends this statement through intonation. In the case of "ee", he fixes the intonation which is a sharply falling intonation, but he then says that even "hai" if it is uttered with a sharply falling intonation, implies the speaker's affirmation of the statement. In that case it does not matter what response the speaker makes (even a groan will suffice) provided it has a sharply falling intonation. By adding this reference to intonation to his argument Kitagawa contradicts his own statements with regard "hai" and "ee". The meaning contributed by "hai" differs from the contribution of the
intonation contour and should be discussed separately. The sharply falling intonation has a semantic meaning of affirmation. If hai is a simple recognition response, the speaker would be obliged to continue utterances, otherwise his response (hai) would be interpreted as meaning that the speaker is also convinced that Ms Tanaka is very beautiful. Kitagawa's interpretation of hai as a recognition response with respect is more applicable to haa here. Hai conveys more the assertive attitude of the speaker based on his own judgement. If the speaker has previously considered Ms Tanaka to be very beautiful, he is more likely to respond to the addressee by saying hai. The difference between hai and ee in this context is the speaker's attitudes, hai conveys the speaker's assertive attitude to his own proposition, while ee conveys the speaker's submissive attitude to the addressee's proposition. The degree of acceptability of ee is considerable, since ee indicates the speaker's submissive attitude toward the addressee. Hai indicates that the speaker's conviction with regard to his own proposition, a proposition that is only implied by his response.

Hinata (1980) says that Kitagawa's treatment of hai does not accurately describe the nature of hai. According to Hinata hai indicates the speaker's positive attitude rather than simply his recognition of the addressee's previous utterance.

We shall now discuss the other socio-pragmatic factors.

Age is not a crucial factor in determining the choice of RPs. For example, a young executive has power over his subordinates, who may be much older than him. While his subordinates must respond to him by saying hai, the executive does not have to return the same response to

Situation: A young executive (A) is asking his subordinate (B) who is much older than he is to finish a negotiation with the other company.

(24)A: "Kore o katazukeru yoo ni." this ACC finish PLA "Finish this job."

B: "Hai wakarimashita." understood. POL "Yes, I understood."

B who is subordinate, responds to A by saying hai, even though A may be younger than himself. Here is another example:

Situation: A male secretary (A) is reminding his boss (B) of the days schedule. B is an executive manager.

(25)A: "Daisankogyoo kurabu no gosankai ni club GEN luncheon DAT oide ni naruyooni natte orimasu ga." attend HON obligatory COP

"You are scheduled to attend luncheon at the

B a: "Un, iku." go PLA

b: Aa.
*c: Hai.
*d: Haa.
*d: Fe. (Hyooheki:316)

In (25), both A's utterance and B's response clearly show their
power relationship, since A uses the (subject) honorific forms "o-ni
naru" and "orimasu" while B uses the extremely plain form of "iku" (go)
and "un". It is because B is superior to A, that he does not have to
consider maintaining face. Aa is also possible here. Unlike age, gender
plays a significant role in determining the choice of RPs. Consider the
same example but where the executive is female.

(B=female)

(26)B*a: "Un iku."
*b: Hai
*c: Haa
*d: Ee
*e: Aa

First of all, female does not use plain speech style to talk to
others unless she talks to someone who is in-group people such as a
family member, close classmates and so on in the private conversation.
Therefore the speech level does not fit in this case. If she uses the plain
speech style, she will give a masculine impression to the others.

(27)Ba: "Ee ikimasu."
*b: Hai
*c: Aa
*d: Un
*e: Haa
"Yes, I’ll go."

The subordinate reminds her of the day’s schedule, and the female
executive manager shows that she agrees with his (A’s) proposition by
saying ee which indicates a cooperative attitude toward the addressee.
(See further discussion 4.2.2; ee). Hai is acceptable, "Hai ikimasu"
simply conveys, assertively, her intention to meet a future commitment. *Hai* does not imply her respect to her subordinate. She has positive or neutral feeling to her subordinate. *Aa* implies that she is not interested in A's remarks. *Un* indicates that the speaker has clearly recognized her decision which would seem appropriate, however here, the gender factor restricts its choice while *un* is acceptable from a man to a woman or between interlocutors of the same sex, it is reconsidered to be impolite from a woman to a man. She is quite certain about her future actions, so *haa* would be unacceptable.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A theatrical direction (A) is directing actors and actresses during rehearsal. A realizes that the actors and actresses needs a short rest so he says;

(28)Aa: "*Hai* yasunde."

*rest
*IMP(POL)

*b: Haa
*c: Ee
*d: Aa
*e: Un

"Well, let's have a break."

After a while, he says;

A a: "*Hai* hajimemashoo."

*start
*POL
*HOR

*b: Haa
*c: Ee
*d: Aa
*e: Un

"Now, let's start."
The speaker anticipates the situation and is quite convinced that his anticipation is correct. Therefore he uses *hai* at the initial position of his utterance. By saying *hai*, he responds to the situation, based on his anticipative judgement. There is no preceding utterance before (28), although the speaker and the addressee share common ground. The speaker in A1 and A2 in (28) anticipates the addressee's thoughts or desires, and then leads him to the speaker's goal by following imperative or horative sentence form. There is a risk of losing face, if both speaker's and the addressee's goals are different. Consequently, the speaker uses *hai* in this environment, since he responds to the addressee's expectation with his convinced anticipation. The other four RPs are totally unacceptable in this situation. *Un* conveys the speaker's conviction about the solidarity between the addressee and the speaker. However, *un* does not imply power over the addressee (or a desire to control and influence the addressee), since *un* is essentially speaker-oriented and is directed toward the speaker himself or the person who is very intimate with the speaker therefore the speaker can identify the addressee with the speaker himself, while *hai* is addressee-oriented and directed toward the addressee in those situations where the solidarity does not have to be considered. In certain context *hai* can be integrated as conveying the speaker's politeness, however this is a socio-pragmatic effect which does not always apply. *Hai* obviously does not need to convey politeness, formality or respect, but rather show a positive attitude toward the addressee. We have already shown in Chapter 3 that *hai* does not convey politeness, but rather shows a positive attitude
towards the addressee in the examples like those (chapter 1) repeated below.

Example (7) in Introduction.

"Hai doo doo."
"Come on, giddy-up."

Example (8) in Introduction.

"Hai miruku."
"Come on, have some milk."

We differ from Kitagawa in that we argue that it is through the speaker's positive attitude toward the addressee, which is a semantic component of *hai*, that the sense of 'politeness' arises.

This sense of politeness that is associated with *hai* can be best interpreted in terms of the Gricean Maxims which constitute the Cooperative Principle. *Hai* fulfills all four Gricean Maxims which makes it an ideal response in those situation which require a sincere display of cooperation. This use of *hai* accords with what logicians call truth value. In this sense *hai* is the most transparent of the response particles, the one which most naively conveys the feelings of the speaker, and conversely is the response particle which least conveys the sense of tact, diplomacy or strategy in the speakers response.

The above discussion can be illustrated in the following table.
Hai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>S &lt; A</td>
<td>(within In-group unrestricted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>S &lt; A</td>
<td>(within In-group unrestricted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech style</td>
<td>Polite style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>recognition of Addressee's remark with conviction in order to maintain face for the speaker and the addressee by protecting face of speaker's own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

From the above observations we may conclude that hai has the following semantic-pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive that you want me to say/do something and that you think I will do it.
(b) I am sure I know what you want me to say/do.
(c) I think I should say things to you in the way one says things to people for whom one feels something good.
(d) I say this because I want you to know I will say/do what you want me to do.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of an expectation on the part of the other addressee. Component (b) shows that the speaker understands the nature of his expectation and shows his conviction that he understands what is expected of him. Component (c)
spells out an attitude which in some contexts can be interpreted as formality or respect but which is also compatible with the attitude of a mother or father speaking to a baby. Component (d) indicates speaker's positive and cooperative attitude toward the addressee and his willingness to comply with the addressee's expectation.

4.3.2 Haa

The main characteristic of politeness in haa is evasiveness, used as a strategy of tact in order to save face on both sides. Haa is, moreover, the speaker's expressed means of avoiding commitment to the addressee's proposition, though by effectively throwing the question back at the addressee it also gives the addressee the option of continuing the conversation. This is the feature of politeness that Brown and Levinson (1978:216) call "off record":

...the actor leaves himself an 'out' by providing himself with a number of defensible interpretations; he cannot be held to have committed himself to just one particular interpretation of his act.

Haa is effected by two crucial socio-pragmatic factors: social status and out-groupness. Children cannot use haa hence the use of the expression is confined to adult circles only.

Consider the following example:

Situation: A (male) is a managing director and B (also male) is his subordinate.

(29) A1: "Kimi, Kyoo wa zutto sha ni iru ka?"  

you today TOP always office LOC be Q PLA

"Are you going to be in the office all day?"
B1: "Orimasu."
be
POL
"Yes, I am."

A2: "Yuugata made?"
evening until
"Until evening?"

B2a: "Haa."
b: Ee.
?c: Hai.
*d: Aa
*e: Un
"Yes sir."
(Hyoheki:453)

The familiar pronominal vocative "kimi"22 and the plain speech style "iru" used by A are indicative of his superiority over B. B responds with the humble form of the copula "orimasu", to assure A that he is going to be in the office. However, A asks B again, this time specifically stating "until evening?". B may not understand A's utterance, given the context. Therefore, by saying haa, B both requests information and also expresses some irritation at the aggressive style of A's questioning. Thus face is maintained on both sides. Hai could also be acceptable here, though there is definitely doubt in B's mind as to why A is asking so specifically about his whereabouts for the day, and hai would not adequately express these doubts. Ee could also be a possible response here, however, within the wider context of this example the power relationship between A and B together with B's rather independent

22 See Harada (1976:511) for further information regarding the use of "kimi".
character, deem it, despite his formally subordinate role, an inappropriate response. *Aa* and *aa* cannot be used here because it would be impossible for the speaker to identify or ignore his addressee with a response that is directed only to himself.

The gender factor is not important in the use of *hāa*. Consider the following example:

Situation: A (male) loves B (female) but B is a married lady and does not love A, return his love, although she is sensitive to his feelings. A is asking B what she thinks of him

(30) B1: "Konna koto o mooshiageru no wa such thing ACC tell GEN TOP
HUM iyana n desukedo, ano yo wa dislike COM COP though that evening TOP POL
watakushi aijoo o motteita to I affection ACC had QUOT PLA
omoimasu. Demo hoka no toki wa.....” think but other GEN occasion TOP POL
“I don’t really want to talk about it. I think that I loved you on that night, but the rest of the time ...”

A1: "Motteinai to iu n desu ne.” have QUOT say COM COP SFP NEG PLA POL
“You are saying you don’t love me, aren’t you?”

B2 a: "Hāa.”
b: Ee
'Maybe' and 'determination' are incompatible. It's obvious here that A and B are at cross purposes. A wants B to love him but she does not. B could clearly explain her feelings to A, but in order to maintain face she employs a rather indirect response. At the same time, however, B has to convey her determination to A, so she uses the metalinguistic approach. When she says haa, she nods with determination, strengthening an indirect linguistic response with a definite metalinguistic response. She uses this strategy successfully and saves face on both sides. Here an evasive response (haa) is the most suitable, because hai and ee would indicate that B is agreeable to A's proposition.

Consider another example:
Situation: A (female) is a historian and B (male) is a photographer. They are acquaintances and accidentally meet each other on a trip.

(31) A1: "Kyoo mo satsuei desu ka?"
Are you taking pictures again today?

B1: "Haa. Aikawarazu desu." Yes. As usual

A2: "Fukuhara-san wa omieninarimasen no?" Mr. TOP be

(Hyoheki: 195)
"Isn't Mr Fukuhara here?"

B2: "Haa, Fukuhara-san wa kesa hayaku Kyoto ni yooji ga atte, ikaremashita..."

"Yes, Mr Fukuhara has gone to Kyoto early this morning, he has a job to do there,..."

(HI no michi:60)

A and B have good feelings towards each other, though there is no solidarity established between them. Therefore un and aa cannot be used here. Although B's answers are indirect [in keeping with the polite speech level] they do convey enough information to each other.

In the novel from which the above extract is taken, B appears as an independent, masculine personality. Therefore, though hai and ee could both be used in this situation, neither would be appropriate, as their use would be contrary to the established image of B. If B answered by using hai B would be responding conventionally, this is not in keeping with B's independent personality and would also place too much psychological distance between A and B. Ee does not suit B's character either since it denotes shared ground - and here A and B do not share sufficient ground to communicate to each other in this way.

Gender is not a crucial factor in the choice of haa, though social status, i.e. the power relationship, does effect the use of this RP. Consider the following examples:
Situation: A (female) is a journalist, and a client of B (male) who is a hairdresser. They have known each other for a while but their relationship, which will become intimate, is as yet constrained by the status of each individual.

(32) A: "Kaketara" sit COND PLA

"Why don't you take a seat?"

B1 a: "Haa." b: Hai c: Ee d: Aa e: Un "Why don't you take a seat?"

"Yes."

A2: "Juusu demo nomu?" juice for instance drink PLA

"Would you like a drink? Juice, perhaps?"


In this example, although they are peers in terms of age, A is B's customer and her job as a journalist makes her useful to B who, as it transpires, later seeks her assistance in advertising his business. Therefore A has power over him, and this is reflected in her plain speech.

style which is intended to establish solidarity between them. B on the other hand is in a much weaker position than A, and conveys his humble attitude by responding with haa. In Japanese society, if a guest is offered a cup of tea he should politely refuse the offer first and when the host insists, then he may accept the offer. It is considered to be best for B to show that he accepts A’s offer with some reluctance. [For a fuller discussion of these see Brown and Levinson (1978:238).]

The above example (32) illustrates B’s strategic adjustment to A. Here again the power relationship, i.e. social status, is the crucial determinant governing B’s response, which is intended to please A, making her feel that she stands in a position of psychological and social advantage over him.

The following examples demonstrate the effect of the concept of out-groupness has on the social status between two speakers.

Situation: A (male) is a museologist and B (male) is the editor of a publishing company.

(33)A1: "Fukuhara-kun. konomae no kimi no toko last GEN you GEN place no zasshi 2,3-kagetsu mae no goo, GEN journal months ago GEN issue datta ka na, Heianchoobunka tokushuu COP Q SFP period-culture special PLA to iu goo sa.” QUOT say issue SFP PLA

“Mr Fukuhara, a few months ago your company
published a special issue on the culture of the Heian period. I was wondering when exactly.

B1: "Haa. Sensengetsugoo de gozaimashita. the month before COP
 last month HYP-POL23

"Ah yes, that was the month before last."

A2: "Are ureta no?"
that sold COM
PLA
"Did it sell well?"

B2: "Hai. Okagesamade. Urikire no thanks to people's favour sold out GEN

shoten ga zokushutsushite henshuubuyoo bookstores NOM appear in succession for editorial room

no mono made dashiteshimaimashita." GEN stuff gave-finished POL

"Yes, thankfully, we sold right out, our book-sellers even sold our reserve stock."

A3: "Umu. Ippanmuki daroo keredo ikura well for average reader CONJ though even

ippanmuki kaisetsu demo, are wa deki ippanmuki kaisetsu demo, are wa deki
interpretation but that TOP the results

ga yokunakatta." NOM good PLA NEG

23 Harada (1976:555) calls hyperpolite e.g.: | Plain | Polite | Hyperpolite |
copula | da | des-u | de gozai-mas-u
"Well, so much for the average reader, however, even for the average reader, that issue was not good."

B3: a: "**Haa, soo de gozaimasu ka?**"
    so COP Q
    HYP-HON

?b: Hai.
*c: Ee.
*d: Aa.
*e: Un.

"Ah, is that so?"  (Hi no michi:35)

Although A and B know each other, they do not share an "ingroupness" relationship. A is a museologist and has authority in his field of speciality and he is also a customer of B’s whose patronage is to be cultivated. The power relationship between A and B is reflected by their speech levels; A is using a totally plain form of speech while B is using an extremely polite style, what Harada (1976:555) calls hyper-polite (See footnote 22).

A’s first two questions do not show his criticism of the journal, so B, who cannot anticipate his criticism and is himself proud of the issue in question, responds [in B2] confidently with **hai**. However, as soon as he realizes that his superior does not share his attitude, but rather is critical of the issue, then he alters his next response [B3] to **haa**.

The power relationship between A and B constrains the choice of RPs. **Un** and **aa** are inappropriate choices here, as B does not have the choice of establishing solidarity nor can he disregard the reactions of A.
Ee indicates the sharing of common ground but since A and B do not share common ground ee cannot be used.

Situation: A (male) and B (male) are executive directors of different companies. A is a more socially established person than B. B is asking A to do some projects/experiments for him.

(34) A: "Oyobi itashimashite kochira wa Tohookakoo call this TOP HON no Yashiro desu ga. Senjitsu wa GEN COP the other day TOP shitsurei itashimashita." excuse me POL

"This is Mr Yashiro of the Tohookakoo company calling to say thank-you for the other day."

B1: "Tokiwa desu. Kochira koso COP this POL shitsurei itashimashita. "Gotabochuu no naka o excuse me HON busy GEN in ACC kattena onegai o itashimashite." selfish request ACC do HUM

"Mr Tokiwa here, no on the contrary it is I who must thank you, I realize you are very busy and that mine was a selfish request."

A2: "Jitsu wa sono ken nan desu ga..." fact TOP that case COM COP/POL

"Well, I am calling about that same matter also."

?b:  Hai.
?c:  Ee
*d:  Aa
*e:  Un

B3: “Ja, 1-ji goro ga gotsugoo yoroshii
1 o'clock about ACC HON-conditions favourable
deshoo ka.”

“Well, would about 1 o'clock be a suitable time?”

B4: “Ja, jikoku wa 1-ji to shimashite,
well time TOP o'clock QUOT do
POL
dochira e mairimashoo.”
HUM

“Well, the appointment is fixed for one o'clock.
Where shall we go?”

(Hyoheki:317-318)

A and B are out-group people and their power relationship is

equal. B cannot anticipate the matter which A raises in (A2), and while

he must show that he has perceived A's statement, he reserves any

commitment by using an evasive response. When B suggests a time for

their appointment(B3). A responds by saying haa, a polite answer which

still gives the option of changing the arrangements(A3). B then re-
confirms the time because he remains unsure whether or not A's haa expressed agreement. For A3 the other four RPs are not appropriate because A responds evasive way to B.

In the use of haa, the most crucial determinant is the power relationship and the out-groupness factor. Age and gender are not crucial factors.

The above discussion of haa can be illustrated in the following table.

**Haa**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>(Children are excluded)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>S ≤ A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Unknown/known (far)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Style</td>
<td>Polite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>In public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Recognition of addressee's remark with evasiveness in order to maintain face for the addressee and the speaker.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.

From the above observation, we may conclude that haa has the following semantic pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive that you want me to say something and that you think I will do it.
(b) I am not sure I know what you want me to say.
(c) I think I should say things to you in the way one says things to people one does not know.
(d) I say this because I want you to know that I do not know if I will do what you want me to do.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.
Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of an expectation on the part of the addressee. Component (b) shows that the speaker does not understand what is said and he cannot show his attitude or judgement clearly. Component (c) spells out an attitude which can be interpreted as formality since the speaker gives the addressee more options which allows indirectness. Component (d) expresses the speaker's evasive attitude toward the addressee and does not convey the speaker's commitment to his own response.

4.3.3 **Ee**

*Ee* also indicates the indirectness in the speaker's attitude toward the addressee, an indirectness intended to save the face of the addressee. *Ee* also indicates that the speaker intends to identify his goal with the addressee's goal, even if he disagrees with the addressee he is willing to submit and at least appear agreeable in an attempt to establish rapport with the addressee. Therefore, *ee* does not serve as a response to commands (See chapter 3), or to wh- questions in which the interlocutor is seeking information. Because *ee* is not a recognition response but an agreement response the preceding utterances must appear favourable to the speaker. This indicates that *ee* is the most addressee-oriented of all these five RPs (*hai, haa, ee, aa, un*).

If social status is not a main determinant, what then is the crucial socio-pragmatic factor governing the use of *ee*? I assume that there is no restriction of socio-pragmatic factors except that *ee* required that some sort of common ground, whether temporary or permanent, exits between the speaker and the addressee. The in-
groupness factor is more influential than other factors. Ee is again considered unsuitable for children to use, since children are expected to express themselves clearly and independently, and are discouraged from availing themselves of such conversational devices or strategies.

Language textbook writers treat ee as a female expression and some novelists also use ee in this way.

We now examine both cases of the textbook treatment and that of novelists. Consider the following examples which cited from the textbook of "Nihongo Hyoogen Bunkei" (Japanese Language Expression Pattern).

Situation: A and B are female friends.

(35)A: "Maa hisashiburi. Zuibun kuroku well a long time quite dark natta wa ne." became SFP SFP PLA

"Well, I haven't seen you for ages. You have got quite a tan, haven't you?"

B: "Ee, Umi e itteita no. Sukoshi beach ACC was COM a little PLA

oyogeru yooni natta no yo." swim became COM SFP POT PLA

"Yes, I have been at the beach. I was able to learn to swim a little."

A: "Ara anata oyogenakatta no."
Oh you swam COM
POT
PLA
NEG

"Oh! couldn't you swim before?"

B: "Ee, zonzon. Anata wa natouyaoumi
not at all you TOP summer holiday
"No, not at all."
nani o shiteita no?"
what ACC were doing COM

"What did you do for your summer?"

Situation: A and B male friends.

(36) A: "Yaa hisashiburi da na. zuibun kuroku natta ne."
hey a long time COP SFP quite dark became SFP
PLA

"Gee, you've got a good tan."

B: "Un, umi e itteita n da.
yeah beach ACC was COM COP
PLA

Sukoshi oyogeru yooni natta yo."
a little swim became SFP
POT
PLA

"Yeah, I have been at the beach. I was able to
earn to swim a bit."

A: "Are kimi oyogenakatta no ka?"
hey you swam COM Q
POT
PLA
NEG

"Hey, couldn't you swim before?"
The above examples (male speaker: un, female speaker: ee) confirms their conventional social gender roles. The way novelists treat un and ee also reflects the user's gender role. We have discussed one example (25) in chapter 4. Let's reconsider this example correlating them with gender factor and social status factor the example is reproduced here for the reader's convenience.

Situation: A male secretary (A) is reminding his boss (B) of the days schedule. B is an executive manager.

A: "Daisankogyoo kurabu no gosankai ni oide i naruyoo ni natte orimasu ga."

"You are scheduled to attend luncheon at the Daisankogyoo club."

B: a: "Un iku."
   b: Aa
   *c: Hai
   *d: Haa
   *e: Ee

A male executive, does not have to make an effort to maintain face for himself or his inferior addressee. But it is better for him to treat his subordinates as, in-group people with whom he shares
solidarity. He does not however, have to submit himself in any way to the addressee, so "Ee ikimasu." would be an inappropriate response in this case. On the other hand, in the case of female executives "Ee ikimasu" is a most suitable response, for by saying this the speaker conveys her submissive attitude toward the addressee in order to maintain solidarity between herself and her subordinate. The female executive creates solidarity by being submissive and saving her inferior's 'face'. The male executive shows solidarity by being assertive and showing no regard for his inferior's 'face'. If she talks to her subordinate in friendly way, she may say "Ee iku wa" which can be said only among in-group people such as families, close classmates or close colleagues, since it is well known that some sentence final particles in Japanese indicate the speaker's gender. The SFP of "wa" here convey the speaker's attitude of intimacy toward the addressee.

24 The point is demonstrated by McGloin (1986:21) "... the femininity of "wa"... lies essentially in a sense of conversational rapport [women] create between the speaker and the learner. By using "wa"... , the speakers seeks to establish an atmosphere of sharedness. "Wa" directs an emotional emphasis toward the addressee and their engenders an emotional common ground with the addressee." (McGloin 1986:21) (Emphasis is mine)

McGloin explicates the femininity of "wa" in the semantic/ pragmatic property of "wa" "to assert a proposition with emotional emphasis" and gives the following "semantic/pragmatic representation":

I strongly feel this is the case.
I hope you will share the same feeling or view.

So ee and "wa" can be seen here to be correlated in the sense that they both express those attitudes which are thought of as being feminine - submission and engendering common ground. However, the role of a woman executive constrains her choice of vocabulary, she should not use emotional emphasis in a formal situation. This social setting restricts the use of "ee iku wa", ought not to be used by female executives in this case. Un and "wa" are incompatible in the female speech, since un is speaker-oriented and conveys the speaker's assertive attitude toward the addressee. "Wa" bears a more submissive attitude, if it is uttered with rising intonation. The falling intonation has its own semantic component, it indicates the speaker's assertiveness (cf. Kitagawa 1977). McGloin states that the feminine "wa" directs this emotional emphasis toward the addressee, but the masculine wa does not. So un and wa can be compatible when spoken by men. Un is speaker-oriented and consequently correlated with
social setting still strongly influences gender roles. However, in practice, when people meet informally, in social setting involving in-group people, the social gender role disappears. On such RPs are used both by men and women, un being the most common. However, my data suggests that the gender factor is not so influential. The sources of my data are mainly published materials such as novels, TV scenarios, or live recorded conversations which are cited in the journal "Gengoseikatsu" (Living language). As a result of researching these materials it has become apparent that the use of ee is not always restricted by gender. As Ide states, "there is a universal hypothesis that women speak more politely than men". Ee contains a sense of the speaker's intention to be very cooperative with the addressee, and it is this sense of cooperation, rather than strictly the speakers gender, which gives ee the reputation of being a women's word, for in Japanese society cooperativeness is held to be a prototypically feminine attitude.

Ee confirms women's attitudes in the conversation. Ee is the speaker's device for avoiding future conflict with the addressee, as is evident from the example below.

The masculine use of "wa", which is also speaker-oriented. In male speech wa is uttered with a falling intonation so can be interpreted as an "assertion".

Ee is extremely addressee-oriented so correlates with the feminine use of wa. The RP aa is extremely speaker-oriented, since the speaker disregards the existence of the addressee. Consequently, aa is incompatible with the feminine use of "wa".

25 Peng et al. (1981) Ide also notes that "aizuchi.. (supportive response particles such as un, hai, ee, hee, and other such words while listening to someone) are used by women much more frequently than by men. Supportive responses are often used to signal one's receptive, interest, encouragement and the like. Frequent use of these supportive responses, then "again reflects women's desire to create a positive conversational atmosphere by acknowledging interest in the conversation".

Jorden (1963,11:271) gives English equivalent expression of "hee" in the following way: "really", "You don't say!" and "No kidding!".


Situation: A is a hairdresser and a playboy who has just killed someone. He needs an alibi. He is endeavouring to take advantage of a woman (B). B seems to have never had any boyfriends and has long ceased to play the women's social role. She wears men's style clothes and uses men's language.

(37) A: "Kinoo wa sha no shigoto de, tsumari yesterday TOP company GEN work INS in a word shuzai ni boku no tokoro ni kite interview DAT my GEN place LOC come GER ita n da. li na. Wakaru ne?"
   was COM COP alright SFP understand SFP PLA PLA PLA
   "So yesterday you came to my place on business for an interview in fact. OK - have you got that."

B a: "Ee."
*b: Hai.
*c: Haa
*d: Aa
*e: Un

"Yes." (Yakoo no kaidan:461)

The author describes how B responds to A; by looking anxiously at him, returning to a female role and re-adopting a feminine speech style. The woman totally and passively submits herself to A as a result of his statements. Both A and B intend to establish solidarity, however, B's attitude is totally passive and constrains her response. Un would establish solidarity between A and B however it is in appropriate to B's passive manner. Aa is totally inappropriate, the use of aa conflicts with
B's goal of wanting to be with A. She is totally cooperative to A, therefore, haa is not appropriate either. Hai conveys some degree of formality, which also contradicts B's goal.

Ee here is a polite response since by saying ee the speaker does not force the addressee to take responsibility or commit himself. This lack of force is typical of Japanese women's speech, consequently, women use ee more frequently than men. However as I mentioned in Chapter 3, un is frequently used by female students in situations where one would normally expect to hear ee. So the reality of speech use conflicts with the theory of ee being gender determined.

Consider the following examples:

Situation: A (female) and B (male) are intimate friends, and he also happens to be her hairdresser. A phones B to see if he can leave work to meet her.

(38)A1: "Ima chikaku ni iru wa. Sugu derareru no?"

B1: "Sukoshi gurai no jikan nara kamaimasen.

A2: "... Ara, soko ni dareka iru no?"
"Oh, is there somebody there with you."

A speaks to B in a plain intimate speech style, unaware that he is not alone. His polite response throws her momentarily, and prompts her to ask if he is guarding his speech because of the presence of someone third person. His temporary social setting effects B’s choice of RP. He cannot disregard A’s existence, so cannot use *aa, yet B cannot freely express himself either, so cannot show solidarity towards A by using the expected *un. *Haa conveys the speakers evasiveness which is not a satisfactory response for B to give, as A will only continue to ask more questions. If B says *hai here, he will effectively validate A’s suspicion that there is somebody else with him. B does not want to do this and does not want A to be convinced that A is right. Therefore *hai is not suitable. In order to avoid committing himself in the matter by being submissive, *ee is suitable. By saying *ee, B saves A’s face. In the following example, the same speakers A and B are talking privately, when they met later.

(39) A: "Sakki no denwa wa hontooni before GEN telephone TOP truly jimusoho de deta no?"
office LOC COP COM
PLA
"Did you truly receive my last phone call in the office?"

B: a "Aa soo da yo!"
    so COP SFP
?b Un
*c Hai
*d Haa
*e Ee

"Yes, that's right." (Yakoo no kaidan: 216)

Both A and B talk at the same speech level, plain style. B does not have to consider the situational circumstances, and also he can repair whatever damage might be done much easier in face-to-face discourse. Also he is free to choose his strategies regarding the use of RPs. By choosing aa, he disregards A's reaction. Hai and Haa always co-occur with the polite speech style, so they are not appropriate here. Ee does not have correlation with male plain speech style (... da).

These examples (38) and (39) illustrate the correlation between speech style and the choice of RPs. Thus the social setting crucially affects language use. In addition, the psychological distance also influences the determination of choice for RPs. This occurs during the discourse where the degree of familiarity or intimacy between the speaker and the addressee increases causing a change in the speaker's choice of RPs. Examples (31) and (40) illustrates this case: A and B are acquaintances but they are not really familiar with one another in (31). At that stage, B's responses was Haa. Later when A and B become more interested in and closer to each other, B's choice of RPs is effected by the degree of familiarity.
Compare the following example with (31):

Situation: A is a historian and B is a photographer. Again, they met accidentally on the train returning home from a trip.

(40) A1: "Oshigoto no okaeri desu ka?"

HON+work GEN HON+return COP Q

"Are you coming back from your work?"

B1: "Ee, Kumano kara Nankiittai o from district ACC

mawatte kita no desu. 3 ka bakari kakatte." circle came COM COP 3 days about took

GER PLA POL GER

"Yes, I went around to the Nanki district from Kumano. I spent 3 days to do so."

A2: "Kondo wa ohitoride"

this time TOP HON+by yourself

"Did you go round by yourself?"

B2: "Ee, Shuppansha no hoo de hitoride publishing company GEN by myself

itte kure to iu mon desu kara." go receive QUOT say COM COP since

GER GER IMP PLA POL

"Yes, the company asked me to go by myself."

(Hi no michi: 185)

It is apparent that B wants to establish rapport with A. Therefore B is informative enough toward A. First of all, B fulfills A’s required information by saying ee and then provides further information referring to A’s concern. Thus as a response to A’s question, B provides
more information than is required by A by adding extra detail information after ee. It is natural that one provides a reasonable amount of an overstatement when one intends to establish rapport with someone or to show a cooperative attitude. This seems to violate the Maxims of Quantity and Manner from Gricean point of view. However, ee in itself does not violate any Grice’s maxims.

Compare the following example with the above (B1) (B2).

Situation: A (male) is a hospital superintendent who is interested in B (female) and is asking her some private questions about her background.

(41) A: “Tannaru miaikekkon?”
merely arranged marriage

“Was it merely an arranged marriage?”

B a: "Hai."
?b: Haa.
?c: Ee.
*d: Aa.
*e: Un.

"Yes." (Yokuboo no ... :131)

B does not have any intention of establishing rapport with A, since there is no familiarity or common ground between them, therefore ee questionable RP here. Haa is acceptable. If B does not want to respond with details, it would be quite acceptable for her to choose the evasive response of haa. As there is no solidarity between A and B, un is inappropriate. B cannot disregard A’s existence since a is extremely superior to B, so neither can she use aa. Consequently, given the situation, hai is the most suitable response because of the need for
sincere directness since the power relationship is the main determinant of the speaker's choice.

All the preceding examples here have been between males and females. In the following example, A and B are both male. They are not 'in-group' but they do share common ground. Their goals can be considered to be the same.

Situation: A is a detective and B is a witness that A is questioning about the activities of a criminal.

(42) A: "Sonotoki untenshiteita hito wa then drive person TOP PLA handoru o nigiri nagara tabako o handle ACC hold while cigarette ACC kuwaetimashita ka?" was gripping Q POL

"So the driver was holding a cigarette in his mouth while he had his hands on the wheel, is that right?"

B a: "Ee, kuwaetabako de untenshiteimashita yo." INS was driving SFP POL

b: Hai,

B c: Haa,

*d: Aa,

*e: Un,

"Yes, he was driving with a cigarette in his mouth."

(Jumanbun no ... :416)

Situation: A is a female detective and B is a policeman. B
responds to A’s question.

(43) B: “Ee, ano ban wa kenka ya that evening TOP fighting like nanika ga chotto ookatta desu ne. something NOM a little bit many COP SFP POL

"Yes, there was some trouble that evening, rather more than usual." (Fuirumu ga...: 136)

Situation: A is a female detective, is questioning a male witness B.

(44) A1: “Hitotsu ukagaitai koto ga arimashite.” one ask COM ACC have DES POL

"There’s something I want to ask you."

B1: “Nan deshoo?” what COP CONJ POL

"What’s that?"

A2: “Ano toki kyuuni okoridasareta to kai. Osake wa that time suddenly get angry QUOT Q wine TOP HON nonde orarenakatta no deshoo?” drink COP COM COP GER PAS CONJ NEG POL

"At that time I understand you suddenly became angry, yet you hadn’t been drinking."

B2a: Ee.
b: Hai.
c: Haa.
"Yes, that's right." (Fuirumu ga...:138)

In all these examples (42) (43) (44), the speakers who utter the RPs are male and A and B are unfamiliar with each other, that is, they are not in-group people, however they do temporarily share common ground. The speaker in (42) (43) (44) are very cooperative toward the addressee's, and try to establish rapport with them. This is face-maintaining for the addressee. Here the speech level of all utterances is polite, since the relationship between A and B is not intimate and yet they are not talking at a private level, but in an official interview. Therefore addressee-oriented RPs should be used in (42) (43) (44). A expects B to agree with A's thought, or A predicts B's answer. For example, in (42), whether or not the driver was holding a cigarette in his mouth is a crucial point for A, so that if it is true, B shows his agreement with A's proposition. As a result, $ee_A$ is most appropriate. In (44), if B responds to A by saying $aa$ or $un$, this indicates that B has changed his attitude toward A drastically. There is no correlation between the speech level of (B1) and that of (B2). Therefore it is inappropriate for B to use $aa$ and $un$ here. Both $hai$ and $haa$ are acceptable. $Haa$ conveys the speaker's evasiveness, so that if he hesitates or is not sure whether or not he got drunk then, it is a suitable response. $Hai$ conveys the speaker's commitment, but it is unnecessary to show his commitment in this case because of the type of the question (A2) in (44). A is seeking agreement from B by using the structure [nakatta no deshoo]. This leads B to respond by saying $ee$, because of a
structure of A's utterance (NEG+COM+HOR). Ee indicates B's submissive attitude toward A and shows B's agreement with A. Thus, social status, out-groupness/in-groupness, age and gender factors are not crucial determinants in the use of ee. In the case of ee, politeness is a subsidiary consideration, the speakers are instead casting themselves in the role of collaborators and it is important to them that the maximum amount of information is exchanged. This explains why the speaker typically follows ee with more information than the addressee requests (40).

The above discussion can be illustrated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted (children excluded)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td></td>
<td>$S \leq A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech style</td>
<td></td>
<td>Polite style (male/female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plain style (female)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement with addressee's remark with submissiveness in order to maintain face for the speaker and the addressee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7

From the above observations we may conclude that ee has the following semantic-pragmatic components:

(a) I perceive that you want me to say something and
that you think I will do it.
(b) I want to do what you want me to do.
(c) I think I can say things to you in the way one says things to people whom one knows, and wants the same things to happen as one would want to happen to oneself.
(d) I say this because I want you to know that I will say I do what you want me to do.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of an expectation on the part of the addressee. Component (b) and (d) shows that the speaker is cooperative with the addressee and agrees with the addressee's proposition. Component (c) shows that the speaker's submissiveness toward the addressee's proposition. The speaker submits himself to the addressee's proposition. The speaker intends to share the world with the addressee.

**4.4 Summary of the differences between hai, haa, ee, aa and un.**

We have already shown that all five of these response particles can serve as positive polarity responses; that is they are all acceptable answers to YES/NO questions. We have further distinguished two features that provide useful subcategorizations between these RPs. The first of these was Speaker/Addressee Oriented and the second was Speaker's Attitude.

In terms of Speaker/Addressee Orientation we showed that these five RPs fall naturally into two subcategories - aa and un being essentially Speaker Oriented and hai, haa and ee being essentially
Addressee Oriented.

We have also suggested that they differ in their degree of Speaker or Addressee orientation. In the table below we try to capture these differences by presenting the five RPs as relative points on a Speaker Oriented-Addressee Oriented continuum.

The occurrence possibility scale of RPs in the Speaker-Oriented and the Addressee-Oriented dimensions.

| Addressee oriented | | |
|--------------------| | |
| 0                  | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker oriented</th>
<th>aa</th>
<th>un</th>
<th>hai</th>
<th>haa</th>
<th>ee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Figure 9.

We retain the notion of two subcategories by having the RPs arranged either side of the neutral line a cross the middle of the diagram. In the figure above we use bars arranged on either side of a neutral position to Response Particles. Firstly the distance between the central neutral line and the beginning of the bar indicates the degree to which the response particle diverges from a neutral position in its orientation towards the speaker or the Addressee.

Secondly, the length of the bar itself indicates the range across
the spectrum between neutral and Speaker/Addressee oriented dimensions that the RP covers.

We retain the notion of two subcategories by having the RPs clustered around a neutral central point of the continuum.

The addressee oriented responses occur with either polite or plain speech depending on the dynamics of the relative social positions of the speaker and addressee. Speaker oriented responses on the other hand can only occur with the plain speech style. *Aa* is extremely speaker-oriented and indicates that the speaker is disinterested in the existence of the addressee. Therefore, the use of *aa* implies the speaker's arrogance toward the addressee in the interaction with the addressee in a speech situation.

*Un* is speaker-oriented, since *un* indicates the speaker's self-conviction of his own proposition and it is uttered toward the speaker himself. When it is used in the speech situation the speaker actually identifies the existence of the addressee with that of himself and feels no psychological distance from the addressee.

*Hai* conveys to the addressee, the speakers conviction about his own proposition, so it too is addressee oriented. However with *hai* the speaker is not only being assertive towards the addressee, he is also convincing himself of his proposition, so the degree of addressee orientedness is tempered by a kind of speaker-orientedness.

*Haa* indicates that the speaker is being evasive. He is disinclined to respond to what has been said to him, either because he failed to anticipate the utterance and wants to indicate that he needs more
contextual information before he can respond, or because he does not wish to commit himself to any definite response at all. *Haa* is a very polite response and is essentially addressee oriented. Since the speaker gives the addressee freedom of choice by being evasiveness.

*Ee* indicates the speaker's submissiveness toward the addressee's proposition and is therefore extremely Addressee oriented.

The table below shows the RPs arranged in terms of these two features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Orientation</th>
<th>Conviction</th>
<th>Submissiveness</th>
<th>Evasiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speaker Oriented</td>
<td><em>un</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>aa</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addressee Oriented</td>
<td><em>hai</em></td>
<td><em>ee</em></td>
<td><em>haa</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10.

These features can be correlated with Gricean Maxims. This can be summarized in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPs</th>
<th>Gricean Maxims</th>
<th>hai</th>
<th>haa</th>
<th>ee</th>
<th>aa</th>
<th>un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manner</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11.

*Hai* and *un* imply that the speaker clearly recognizes the stimulus and implies the speaker's assertion of his own proposition toward the
addressee in the speech situation. They are related to sincerity and seriousness in polite behaviour. Robin Lakoff’s rules of pragmatic competence: "be clear" and "be polite" reflect the Gricean Maxims and are applicable to un and hai, both of which bear out Lakoff’s theories. The other three RPs (haa, ee and aa) do not confirm to Lakoff’s “be direct” pragmatic competence rule. Haa and aa are extremely indirect and ee is only moderately so. The politeness feature of haa is evasiveness which violates the Quality and Quantity Maxims. Though a most indirect expression, haa can nonetheless be interpreted as a most polite expression, since it gives the addressee the option of making a judgement. Ee indicates the speaker’s cooperative attitude toward the addressee’s proposition but does not reflect the logician’s traditional concern with truth. Therefore ee violates to some extent, the Quality Maxim. This is largely due to its submissiveness.

Aa does not fulfill the Quality, Quantity and Manner Maxims, since the speaker is offering minimum information to the addressee in the speech situation. Frequently the speaker does not intend to share the conversational goal with the addressee.

Hai and un confirm the Cooperative Principle (i.e. Gricean Maxims) but haa, ee and aa cannot be explicated in terms of the Cooperative Principle. The Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principles interact in the use of RPs. However, in reality, the Cooperative Principle is not always sufficient. For example, haa, ee and aa cannot be explicated by it because of the nature of their core meanings manifested in them as communicative strategies. Leech’s Politeness Principle might, however, be applicable, for example, ee can
be explained by Leech's "Agreement maxim", that can be explicated by his "Modesty Maxim".

The function of RPs, although conditioned (e.g. by YES/NO questions in which the respondent's directness, based on the truth value, is essential) is to show positive polarity. Accordingly, these RPs inevitably relate to the Cooperative Principle to some extent. However, "... the CP in itself cannot explain why people are often so indirect in conveying what they mean". Therefore, the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle cannot be applied separately in the analyses of these five RPs because (a) not every RP can be explained in terms of the Cooperative Principle, and (b) pragmatic factors are not determining factors in the usage of all RPs. This is in agreement with Leech's proposal that "the CP and PP interact in the interpretation of indirectness (politeness - TK)". In order to overcome the limitations of the Cooperative Principle and Politeness Principle, we have coined new terms to describe politeness: "conviction", "submissiveness" and "evasiveness".

---

26 See G.N. Leech, 1983:131-150
CONCLUSION

Response Particles of one form or another are found in most languages. In Japanese traditional grammar and also in textbooks which aim to teach Japanese to non-native speakers the treatment of Response Particles has always been inadequate. They are usually described either intuitively in terms of the 'politeness of the speech situation' or in relation to RPs in another language which cannot be expected share equivalence. Dictionary definitions have always been circular.

Those few previous works which have attempted to distinguish between the meanings of Japanese response particles, have all done so in terms of such socio-pragmatic features as age, gender, social situation etc. We have shown all of the treatments to be inadequate because they fail to account for all usages of the response particles. For instance Kitagawa's definition of the RP "hai" as an indicator of the speakers 'respect' for his addressee, clearly fails to explain the possible use of "hai" in speech to a child or even an animal.

The presumption that has formed the basis of our methodology, is that any attempt to distinguish clearly between the five Response Particles and account for all their usages, must first distinguish between the actual lexical semantic components of the RPs and those socio-pragmatic components which influence their selection. In Chapters 2 and 3 we introduced two concepts which we used as a basis for distinguishing between the RPs. Firstly, "speaker/addressee-orientation", separated those RPs which conveyed information to the addressee, from those RPs which the speaker only intended for his own
ears. Secondly, "speaker's attitude" divided the RPs into 3 types, those expressing conviction, those expressing submissiveness, and those expressing evasiveness.

In Chapter 4 we have attempted to provide a more holistic meaning of the Response Particles by taking the semantic components which we had arrived at in Chapters 2 and 3 and combining them with socio-pragmatic components. We feel that this had enabled us to account for all of the diverse usages of these response particles in as simple a manner as possible.
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DICTIONARIES

towards the addressee in the examples like those (chapter 1) repeated below.

Example (7) in Introduction.

"Hai doo doo."
"Come on, giddy-up."

Example (8) in Introduction.

"Hai miruku."
"Come on, have some milk."

We differ from Kitagawa in that we argue that it is through the speaker's positive attitude toward the addressee, which is a semantic component of hai, that the sense of 'politeness' arises.

This sense of politeness that is associated with hai can be best interpreted in terms of the Gricean Maxims which constitute the Cooperative Principle. Hai fulfills all four Gricean Maxims which makes it an ideal response in those situations which require a sincere display of cooperation. This use of hai accords with what logicians call truth value. In this sense hai is the most transparent of the response particles, the one which most naively conveys the feelings of the speaker, and conversely is the response particle which least conveys the sense of tact, diplomacy or strategy in the speaker's response.

The above discussion can be illustrated in the following table.
Hai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Speaker (S)</th>
<th>Addressee (A)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>S &lt; A (within In-group unrestricted)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy</td>
<td>S &lt; A (within In-group unrestricted)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimacy</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech style</td>
<td>Polite style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>recognition of Addressee's remark with conviction in order to maintain face for the speaker and the addressee by protecting face of speaker's own.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

From the above observations we may conclude that hai has the following semantic-pragmatic components.

(a) I perceive that you want me to say/do something and that you think I will do it.
(b) I am sure I know what you want me to say/do.
(c) I think I should say things to you in the way one says things to people for whom one feels something good.
(d) I say this because I want you to know I will say/do what you want me to do.
(e) I say this in this way because of these things.

Component (a) indicates that the speaker is aware of an expectation on the part of the other addressee. Component (b) shows that the speaker understands the nature of his expectation and shows his conviction that he understands what is expected of him. Component (c)